STRICTURES,

ON

TWO LETTERS,

PUBLISHED BY BARTON W. STONE,

ENTITLED

ATONEMENT.

By John P. Campbell.

The veil is rent, rent too by priestly hands,
That hides divinity from mortal eyes;
And all the mysteries to faith propos'd,
Insulted and traduced, are cast aside
As useless, to the moles and to the bats.
They now are deem'd the faithful, and are prais'd,
Who, constant only in rejecting thee,
DENY THY GODHEAD WITH A MARTYR'S ZEAL.

COWPER.

LEXINGTON,

PRINTED BY DANIEL BRADFORD, MAIN STREET.

1805.

BT265
.C2
offic

30486

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
1899
CITY OF WASHINGTON.

THE INTRODUCTION.

A CELEBRATED *Artist being asked* why he beſtowed ſo much time and pains in finiſhing a certain piece of painting, anſwered, "I paint for eternity." Could I now write for eternity, it would be the happieſt thing imaginable. Not that I dare expect a large ſhare of preſent applauſe, or attempt to purchaſe immortality among thoſe who are honoured with a place in the temple of Fame. It were vanity to hope for the one, and preſumption to enroll myſelf a candidate for the other. And yet there is an immortality to which I may not only aſpire with innocence, but for which I ſhould ſigh with all the ardour of hope, and all the palpitating anxieties of ambition—it is that of hearing at laſt, "Well done thou good and faithful ſervant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

I feel every poſſible ſolicitude in attempting theſe ſtrictures. To be faithful, and yet to be temperate; to expoſe the author's errors, and to feel no undue bias, is the difficulty. Did I feel no perſonal attachment to the author himſelf, and many more, dear to my heart, who are equally involved with him in thoſe errors; or had he ſimply announced his own opinions, without attempting to fix a brand of infamy on thoſe of others, and inſinuate ſo groſsly as he does, reſpecting the religion of all who differ from him in ſentiment, the taſk would be comparatively light. Feeling as I do, every ſentiment of reſpect and friendſhip for him and others of the ſame opinion; and recalling a thouſand pleaſing ſcenes of paſt intercourſe, but not inſenſible to the impreſſion of injury, my conflict is between tenderneſs and indignation; between the emotions of a friend, and the juſt reſentment of an antagoniſt. To repel the il-

liberal and inſulting attack which he makes upon our Confeſſion of Faith, as well as upon the motives and perſonal piety of its compilers and adherents, without the ſeverity of retort; to unravel the ſophiſtries of the publication, without wounding the hand that wrought them; to witneſs the many trifling conceits and puerile criticiſms which occur, without a ſmile of contempt; in one word, to animadvert upon errors ſo fatal and glaring, without attempting to chaſtiſe the temerity of the man who propagates them, will be no eaſy taſk.

Nor are theſe the only difficulties with which I have to contend. Too often it happens, when we enter upon controverſy, that "we know not what manner of ſpirit we are of," and conſequently are very incompetent judges of the ſprings of action within us, or the aſpect of our conduct toward thoſe whom we oppoſe. A fondneſs for ſome favourite theory, is miſtaken for the love of truth; zeal for the intereſts of a party, is baptized with the venerable name of a zeal for the glory of God; down-right ill-nature paſſes for honeſt indignation againſt error; and the bitterneſs of ſarcaſm, is thought to be the very ſoul of temperance, and the ſweetneſs of piety.

Conſidering, therefore, the frailty of our nature, and the poſſibility of erring, where moſt we thought to act with propriety, I think it beſt to promiſe nothing, but caſt myſelf upon the protection and guidance of Heaven, and repoſe upon the candour and generoſity of the publick to bear with my weakneſſes, pity my involuntary errors, and pay more attention to the very intereſting ſubjects diſcuſſed, than to the manner of diſcuſſion.

From Mr. Stone, I beg to be forgiven, if in ſome inſtances I appear to uſe too much ſeverity. For though I muſt mention his errors with unreſerved plainneſs, and warn him of their dangerous tendency, I would not willingly wound his feelings. And nothing would be

more ſoothing to my heart, than to hold an intereſt in his friendſhip, while employed in the invidious work of expoſing notions which have long been the objects of fond reſearch and dilligent propagation, unleſs it were that of being made inſtrumental in his re-converſion to truth.

An apology to the publick for appealing ſo frequently to the original language of Scripture, as I ſhall be compelled to do in this work, I think indiſpenſible. Had not Mr. Stone and his partiſans, attempted to undermine the confidence of the people, in our tranſlation, I ſhould really bluſh to reſt an appeal where a large majority of my readers cannot follow me, or judge of the correctneſs of my obſervations. Though occaſions may offer, when appeals of this nature may not only be proper, but abſolutely neceſſary; yet, generally, they ſhould be regarded as the wretched reſource of dulneſs, to arrive at notice, or the inſidious artifice of error, to impoſe on the credulity of mankind.

There are indeed ſome places in ſcripture, which are not ſo happily tranſlated; yet every perſon that has taken the leaſt care to be informed, knows that theſe inaccuracies never affect a ſingle doctrine of religion, and are more properly the objects of criticiſm, than matters of faith. When it is conſidered, that there is ſuch an exact correſpondence between our tranſlation and thoſe made in all other languages, and that men of the moſt profound erudition have not only acquieſced in it, as ſufficiently correct for general uſe, but even admired it for being the moſt literal and ſublime that has ever been made; it would appear more like inſulting arrogance, or ſottiſh ſelf-ſufficiency, than critical ability, in a writer of our latitude, to arraign and condemn it. Though I have ſpent ſome time and pains, in making myſelf acquainted with the languages, in which the ſcriptures were originally written; I do not ſolicit the attention of the world, to any thing I may advance, or found my plea of credibility upon the mer-

it of my own qualifications, of which I feel no diſpoſition to boaſt, but upon the authority of a large number of the beſt authors, to whom I have had acceſs. As Mr. Stone entitles his book "*Atonement*,"—I do not think myſelf, obliged to take particular notice of other ſubjects, which he has ſo unfairly dragged into view, under every feature of diſtortion, and exaggeration; It will therefore happen that I ſhall paſs over ſeveral ſections without notice; not becauſe I think his arguments formidable, but becauſe his title does not imply theſe ſubjects, and becauſe they will meet with an anſwer in other publications, which have juſt been made. With the beſt will imaginable, the author has aimed at giving a ludicrous, and horrid picture, of our confeſſion, but he ought to know that the faireſt face, may be made either hideous, or ridiculous, at pleaſure by a falſe cover, or colouring; and I am apt to think that the venerable gentleman himſelf, would alternately, excite laughter or horror, were he dreſſed out in a Fools-cap, or an Indian viſor.

STRICTURES ON TWO LETTERS, &c.

CHAPTER I.

Section 1. MR. STONE denies very positively, the existence of any covenant made with Adam, and seems to possess a triumph, when he asserts, that none of the Synods, General Assemblies, or Associations of Europe or America, have ever been able to produce a single passage in proof of such a covenant. Had he cast his eye upon the confession of the Presbyterian Church in America, (without taking the tour of Europe) he would have seen a number of very pertinent texts, adduced in support of the Doctrine. It is in deed strange, that a man who professes so very accurate a knowledge of our confession, preached several years, under its government, and has now written to warn the world against its supposed errors, should almost in the first page make an assertion so palpably erroneous, as to impel his reader, either to suspect his honesty, or charge him with ignorance. Tho' I am unwilling to suspect Mr. Stone's veracity, yet I cannot avoid censuring him for making so violent, and illiberal an attack, upon a book with which he seems so little acquainted.

He tells us in the midst of this imaginary triumph, that "he leaves the Doctrine to Systematics." But does he indeed mean to sneer at system, and ridicule, order, connection, and consistency? System is the soul of the universe. By System was it framed, and by system its parts hang together. Banish system and you bring back the reign of chaos, and the conflict of opposing elements. Banish system from revealed Religion, and you will surrender the plea of analogy, employed in proof of its divine origin.

If the doctrines of the Bible, are not reducible to ſyſtematic form, and ſuſceptible of juſt, and proportioned arrangement; if they want conſiſtency, and harmony of parts, and cannot be brought to hang together with order, and exactneſs; there is every reaſon to reject them, as wanting the impreſs of Divinity, becauſe all the works of God, carry the ſtrongeſt marks of regularity, and harmony. A little attention to ſyſtem, would certainly do Mr. Stone no harm. If his book poſſeſs nothing of it, the defect will be fatal to its exiſtence. "Like the baſeleſs fabric of a viſion, it will diſſolve into thin air," at the firſt waft of ſome oppoſer's wand.

Mr. Stone affects much aſtoniſhment at the credulity of the world, in receiving this doctrine as a fundamental article of religion, when (as he ſays) there is not a ſingle text to ſupport it. Pardon our credulity, my dear ſir, and repreſs your aſtoniſhment, while I quote ſome (as we ſuppoſe) very pointed Scriptures, in proof of the doctrine.—"But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou ſhalt not eat of it: for in the day thou eateſt thereof thou ſhalt ſurely die. And the law is not of faith: but the man that doeth them, ſhall live in them. Moſes deſcribeth the righteouſneſs which is of the law, that the man which doeth theſe things, ſhall live by them. For as many as are of the works of the law, are under the curſe: for it is written, Curſed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them."* That conſtitution which threatens a curſe in caſe of diſobedience, and promiſes life upon obedience, is a covenant in the ſcripture ſenſe of the word. Call it a law, and ſtill that law is denominated a covenant.—"And the Lord ſaid unto Moſes, write thou theſe words; for after the tenor of theſe words I have made

* Gen, ii. 17. Gal. iii. 12. Rom. x. 5. Gal. iii, 10.

a covenant with thee, and with Iſrael. And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neitehr eat bread, nor drink water; and wrote upon the table, the words of the covenant, the ten commandments.—But they, like men, have tranſgreſſed the covenant—Which things are an allegory: for theſe are the two covenants; the one from Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage—The Lord gave me the two tables of ſtone, even the tables of the covenants—And the two tables of the covenant were in my hands—The Lord ſhall ſeparate him unto evil, out of all the tribes of Iſrael, according to all the curſes of the covenant, that are written in this book of the law."*

This is evidently the doctrine of St. Paul, in Rom. v. 12—21, and 1 Cor. xv. 21—48: where, though the word covenant is not mentioned, the thing in ſubſtance is clearly ſtated. Adam is deſcribed in thoſe paſſages, as the repreſentative of his poſterity, and in that character, involving them in ſin and death, by his violation of the original law, under which he was placed. What makes it undeniable, that he was a repreſentative in covenant, is, that he was called the "figure of him that was to come," and Chriſt is denominated "the laſt Adam." Now, if God made a covenant with the laſt Adam, in whom life is regained, as we know he did, the inference is fair, that he made a covenant with the firſt Adam, in whom life had been loſt.†

If God's law, delivered upon Mount Sinai, was his covenant, made with Moſes and Iſrael, why was not his law, given to Adam, his covenant too? or will any one pretend to alledge, that the one was different from the

---

* Exod. xxxiv. 27, 28. Hoſea vi. 7. Gal. iv. 24. Deut. ix. 11, 15. Deut. xxix. 21.

† Pſ. lxxxix. 3. Iſai. xlii. 6. Heb. x. 5—7.

other, though death reigned alike through both, and sin, lay heavy upon the world, where there was no direct, or ostensible imputation of it, by a written law?* I would be glad to know upon what other principle, than that of representation, or Adam's being a covenant head, and representative, it is, that his posterity have shared so deeply in the sad effects of his fall? Why do thousands of our race, at this moment, who have never sinned personally, writhe in pain, and gasp in death, if they have no relation to Adam as a head, and have no concern in the law by which he was governed?

Sect. 2. The next doctrine arraigned by Mr. Stone, is, that which asserts there is wrath in Deity. He reasons thus: What God is, he is eternally, infinitely, and unchangeably; but God is love; therefore, God is eternal, infinite, and unchangeable love. This argument excludes wrath from Deity. But if wrath be in God, it must be an attribute of his nature; and if an attribute, it must be eternal, infinite and unchangeable; then it would follow, he thinks, that two infinite, eternal, and unchangeable principles, are in God, contrary to one another—love and wrath—which is absurd.

By the same logic I can prove, that in God there is no love: What God is, he is infinitely, eternally, and unchangeably; but he is said in Scripture, to have wrath; therefore God is infinite, eternal, and immutable wrath; such a dilemma leaves no place for love, in the Deity: or if he possess love, it must be an attribute, everlasting, infinite, and immutable; and of course it will happen that there can exist, two infinite, everlasting, and immutable, principles in God contrary to oneanother, wrath, and love, which would be absurd.

The point of fallacy, in this reasoning, may be de-

---

* Rom. v. 13, 14.

fected, by obſerving that more is aſſumed in the concluſion, than is contained in the premiſes. In the premiſes it is only aſſerted that God is infinite, eternal, and unchangeable love; but the concluſion ſtates, that there is no wrath in him; whereas, wrath is not placed in the premiſes. The ſecond dilemma is falſe, becauſe it turns on this aſſumed, and gratuitous poſition, that love and wrath, are adverſe, and contrary qualities which had not been proven.

Another argument on which the author ſeems to rely, is that there can be no wrath in the Deity, becauſe when we are renewed, we feel wrath dying in us If the writer mean, that ſenſe of juſtice, which the upright judge poſſeſſes, and employs in his adjudication, the renewal of our nature, by no means baniſhes that; but rather increaſes, and eſtabliſhes it, and I conceive that principle in the judge, is ſome ſhadow of wrath in Deity: but if he mean the unreaſonable, and fooliſh paſſion of wrath in man, his reaſoning is juſt as good, as if he had ſaid, becauſe we feel ſin dying in us, after converſion; therefore, there is no ſin in God.

When Mr. Stone comes to tell us plainly what he means by that wrath, which he has been proving, is not in God, it comes out to be the wrath, or anger of men. If this be really what he meant, he might have been more ſparing of his argumentation, for there is no one ſo ignorant, as to think God can be the ſubject of a turbulent and blind wrath, ſimilar to that which we ſee ſometimes in man; but this granted, that ſuch anger has no place in the Supreme Being; will it be a neceſſary conſequence, that he has no wrath at all? will it be impoſſible, that he feel a righteous indignation againſt ſinners, or that he can poſſeſs, no virtuous propenſity, to puniſh them for their iniquities.

Mr. Stone obſerves, that "the Scriptures attribute many things to God, which are not really in him, but relatively only," and quotes

a number of texts, to ſhew that God is ſaid to repent, grieve, and be furious; and others to make it evident, that ſuch things cannot be in him. If I take up his meaning, there is ſomething gloomy, and repulſive in this ſentence; for if theſe things which are attributed to him, are not abſolutely poſſeſſed by him in ſome way peculiar to his nature; how do we know that he is poſſeſſed of any thing certainly, and abſolutely. Is there love in God? does he poſſeſs compaſſion, mercifulneſs, long-ſuffering, and patience? the Scriptures, indeed ſay all theſe are in God; but my confidence in its teſtimony, is very much checked, becauſe I am told many things are not, *really in him, but relatively only*. I have then no certain information from the Bible, that God has either love, goodneſs, or any thing elſe, in a ſtrict, and proper ſenſe; for if he is angry relatively, hates relatively; when it is poſitively ſaid he does poſſeſs theſe things, I have nothing to aſſure me that he does not love relatively, and bleſs relatively too. If my fear of his indignation can have no real object, my hope of his mercy can have no proper baſis. One ſtep more would lead to atheiſm: for if his attributes be only relative, his being muſt be relative alſo; for his attributes, characterize his being, and in that caſe, God can have no proper and poſitive exiſtence.

But I chooſe to credit the plain declarations of Scripture, and believe there is that in God which ſtands in oppoſition to ſin, & which will lead him to puniſh the ſinner. Such a propenſion in the divine mind, is in perfect harmony with the exerciſe of love, and every other holy diſpoſition.

In the ſtyle of ſacred writ, it is called wrath, jealouſy, vengeance, anger, indignation, and even fury. "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven againſt all ungodlineſs, and unrighteouſneſs of men. Who knoweth the power of thine anger? Even according to thy fear, ſo is thy wrath. Who can ſtand before his

indignation, and who can abide the fierceneſs of his anger? His fury is poured out like fire, and the rocks are thrown down by him. To me belongeth vengeance and recompenſe. I will render vengeance to mine enemies. He caſt upon them the fierceneſs of his anger, wrath and indignation. He made a way for his anger, he ſpared not their ſoul from death. How long, Lord, wilt thou be angry? for ever? Shall thy jealouſy burn like fire?*

Theſe paſſages, and a thouſand more, ſpeak a language too plain to be miſtaken, that in "the Great and Dreadful God," there is an awful principle, moving him to puniſh tranſgreſſors, and ſupport the dignity of his throne.

Though the Almighty can feel nothing like irritation —nothing of that violent tormenting paſſion called anger in men, which ſtimulates to revenge, and leads on to cruelty, for the ſake of mere gratification; yet that he may poſſeſs wrath, in a pure, holy, and dignified form, appears to me both rational, and ſcriptural.

To deſcribe him as having no anger, but love only, is to confound ideas, and ſtagger all ſpeculation, as if benevolence and hatred to ſin, goodneſs and wrath, judgment and mercy, were the ſame things.

Nor is that all—it gives a very unjuſt and partial repreſentation of his character, by magnifying one perfection at the expence of another. But Paul gives the true character of God, by one happy ſtroke, "Behold therefore, the goodneſs, and ſeverity of God."

It is variety and harmony, energy and ſoftneſs, and

---

* Rom. i. 18. Pſ. xc. 11. Nah. i. 6. Deut. xxxii. 35, 41. Pſ. lxxviii. 49, 50. lxxix. 5.

not dull uniformity, which conſtitutes the ſublime and glorious in character. What a feeble, inefficient God would this doctrine of *no wrath*, make the Supreme Being! No matter what happens in his government, he is always placid, always pacific in temper and operation. No righteous diſpleaſure is felt againſt ſin; no holy indignation burns againſt the tranſgreſſor; no juſt puniſhment is executed upon rebels. Love unnerves the arm of vengeance, and the bolt of deſtruction falls harmleſs at his feet.

It is true the rebel is, or may be miſerable; but that miſery is ſelf-inflicted: God does not puniſh him by any exertion of his will or power. Thus we come to the moſt malignant feature of this doctrine, that the Supreme Being does not poſitively* puniſh ſin, but juſt leaves the ſinner to the neceſſary conſequences of his own conduct.

No truth, however, is more clearly revealed, than that God does actually, and in a poſitive manner, inflict puniſhment upon ſinners. To ſay nothing of the many Scriptures which teach this doctrine, as all theſe can be ſet aſide by the ſweeping reflection, "The Scriptures attribute many things to God, which are not really in him, but relatively only." Behold fact; look into the broad inſtructive volume of nature, and ſee a thouſand and a thouſand facts, to prove that God puniſhes ſin by a ſpecial and poſitive agency. See nations ſwallowed up in a moment by earthquakes, overwhelmed by eruptions from burning mountains, or ſwept away to deſtruction by inundations, tempeſts, and whirlwinds. Yes, the flaming volcano, the ſweeping inundation, the drifted deſert, the furious tempeſt, the convulſive ſhocks of trembling nature, all ſpeak the language of wrath.

---

* By puniſhing ſin poſitively, is meant, the actual infliction of ſome pains, and not merely thoſe ariſing from the exiſtence of ſin in the tranſgreſſor.

Does God indeed rule nature, and controul her laws? If he does, then in giving licence to the deſtructive violence of elements againſt man, he puniſhes ſin poſitively, and manifeſts to all worlds his terrible diſpleaſure againſt it. Atheiſm only, can bar the inference.

Again, turn to that book which details to us many awful parts of the adminiſtration of Divine Providence; not for plain texts to inform us, for theſe can be eaſily managed, as not really meaning what they ſay; but for facts, ſtubborn facts, which, like the gnarled oak, yield not to the wedge of criticiſm. Behold the deluge cover the earth, and ſweep the world into inſtant death. The flames deſcend upon devoted Sodom, and the cities of the plain, and bury their numerous inhabitants in ſudden, undiſtinguiſhed ruin. Behold Egypt filled with plagues, and its firſt born ſons periſh in one dreadful night. See that ſtorm of vengeance ready to burſt upon rebellious Iſrael, when Moſes ſtands in the breach and prays;—that fire from the Lord, which broke out and conſumed the ſons of Aaron;—that leproſy which whitens upon Meriam;—that pit which opened its voracious jaws to ſwallow up Dathan and his company,—and that arm of judgment which ſmote Uzzah for his impious diſtruſt of God, and Herod for his pride and daring uſurpation of God's glory! "Lo! theſe are parts of his ways!" and what is the language which they addreſs to our hearts? None other than this—that judgment, the ſtrange work of the Lord, will inevitably overtake the tranſgreſſor.

It is not true, that the mere exiſtence of ſin in any nature, produces ſufficient and adequate puniſhment; the ſinner might exiſt in this world forever, and be ſo pleaſed with his ſituation as not to deſire to leave it; and why more miſerable in another ſtate, or in the world of ſpirits, if there be no more puniſhment than the reign of ſin in us? The ſinner then, no doubt, becoming conſcious of the want of wrath in God, and that no actual puniſhment ſhall ever be inflicted, will be per-

fectly freed from that dread of puniſhment which now ſometimes diſturbs his mind, and interrupts his peace, and he will enjoy all the ſweets of a wicked nature. Upon this ſcheme, there is no more miſery in hell, than there is amongſt a company of robbers and cut-throats, while revelling in their dark retreats, inapprehenſive of the vengeance of heaven.

But the Apoſtle corrects this fooliſh wickedneſs of the ſinner's heart, when he ſays, "Behold therefore, the goodneſs and ſeverity of God: on them which feel ſeverity."

Sect. 3. Mr. S. ſays, to ſupport the doctrine "of Chriſt being a *surety of the elect, or of mankind, he can find nothing in the Bible.*—Once, and but once, is he called a ſurety, Heb. vii. 22. 'By ſo much was Jeſus made the ſurety of a better teſtament.' Here he is declared to be the ſurety of the new, or better teſtament, and not of the elect. By this muſt be underſtood, that he gave aſſurance or certainty, that the promiſes of this covenant or teſtament, are faithful and true, and that they ſhall be fulfilled to all believers, or made ſure to all the ſeed."—*P.* 7.

So then, God's promiſes were defective in point of certainty and credibility; they were not in themſelves, faithful and true, but required a voucher to give aſſurance or certainty, that they are ſo. Such language from the pen of a Chriſtian miniſter, is horrid indeed! No, ſir, the promiſes needed no ſponſor to give them certainty; they were originally and infalliably true, being the word of God, whoſe veracity is unchangeable, and that word was confirmed by his oath—two immutable things, in which it was impoſſible for God to lie.*

* Heb. vi. 13.

There was, therefore, in the covenant itself, the highest possible certainty, the fullest and most absolute security of its truth and faithfulness; and any additional confirmation was unnecessary and impossible.

Further Christ "gave certainty, that the promises of this testament shall be fulfilled to all believers"—This supposes a disability in God, or at least a possibility of failure; he could not fulfill his promises, or might possibly fail to do so; and Jesus became surety for him, as a person of greater ability and credit; and in that view, undertakes to secure the fulfillment of these promises to believers. A professor of faith in Christ should shudder, and a reasoner who denies his equality with the Father, should be ashamed to deliver so absurd a doctrine.

"To the truth of this Daniel testifies," "and he Christ, shall confirm the covenant with many," Dan. ix. 27. No Sir, Daniel testifies no such thing. Had you quoted the whole of the verse, your reader would have seen at once, that you had mistaken the prophet's meaning "And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease."

Let the reader cast his eye upon the 12th verse of that chapter, and he will find Daniel explain himself—"And he hath confirmed his words which he spoke against our judges, that judged us by bringing upon us a great evil."

By confirming here, the prophet means the fulfilling, or completion of a prediction or the bringing to pass that which had been foretold. Such it is evident is the meaning of the verse quoted, that during the term of one week, he would fulfil the tenor of the covenant, or the promises made concerning the Messiah.

"Paul testifies the same—Now I say, that Jesus

Christ was minister of the circumcision, for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers. Rom. xv. 8." Yes, Paul testifies the same with Daniel; but not the same with Mr. Stone. He does not testify that God's covenant or testament was in such a situation as to require a surety to give it certainty, but that as a minister for the truth of God, he confirmed the promises, to manifest that they were gracious and spiritual promises, to shew their scope and tendency, and to appear as the object of them, in whose incarnation, life and ministry, death and exaltation, they received a glorious completion.

I know not how it could happen, that Gal. iii. 17. should be introduced in proof of this strange doctrine, that God's gracious covenant needed Christ as a confirmer of its truth and stability, when that text gives just the opposite idea—that the covenant was confirmed of God, not only before Christ appeared in the world, to confirm the promises, as Mr. S. attempts to prove by Daniel and Paul; but even four hundred and thirty years prior to the law. The prophet and the apostle speak of the appearance, ministry, and active mediation of Christ; this text carries us back to the covenant long before confirmed of God himself. True the confirmation was in Christ—Yes, a holy God holds no communication, holds no intercourse, gives no promises but in him, "for all the promises of God in him, are, yea, and in him, amen."

The doctrine of the text goes like an axe to the root of this system, which would teach the world that Jesus is not the medium through which mercy flows to man.

"In reference to the same thing. Jesus is often called a witness, Isaiah lv. 4. Behold I have given him for a witness to the people."

"The preceding verse shews for what purpose his testimony was designed: i. e. to make sure the mercies or promises of the everlasting covenant." It is really painful to witness such a flagrant perversion of scripture, as appears in the sentence now quoted. Candid reader, open your Bible to be convinced that no such thing as that the testimony of Jesus was to make sure the promises of the everlasting covenant, is contained in the 3d verse.—"Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live. And I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David. It was already sure, as made with David, and confirmed of God in Christ, four hundred and thirty years before the law—Not a single intimation is given, that the testimony of Jesus was to make it sure.

I leave the author to answer to the public, to his own conscience, and to God, for the representation which he has given here of the mind of the Holy Ghost, and proceed to observe, that the very idea of surety, or sponsor, necessarily implies that there is some deficiency, some imperfection, or some possibility of failure to be guarded against by the credit, and ability of the one who assumes that character.

Now, if Christ be surety of this better testament, defect and failure exist, or is supposed possible some where, either in God, in the testament, or covenant itself, or in the person to whom it is made. Not in God nor in his promises as we have seen, but those to whom the promises are made.

It may be further observed, that he must be surety for one of the covenanting parties, God, or his people. Mr. Stone thinks it quite convincing, that Jesus is declared to be surety of the new and better testament, and not of the elect; but every plain man knows, that the surety of a bond or covenant is connected with one of the parties mentioned in the instrument, and becomes responsible for the person with whom he has assumed the connection.

According to the representation of Mr. S. the duty of a surety is, to confirm a covenant, to bear witness to its truth. But will he get any body to believe, that a witness to a bond or covenant, and a surety are the same thing? or that a surety, or executor has done his duty, when he testifies to the truth of the bond, will, or covenant, should his testimony be admissible? I apprehend not. It is therefore evident, Jesus as surety, must be connected with one party, and bound to the other,—connected with that party in whom the defect lies, with sinners to secure against any failure on their part, that the blessings of the covenant might flow to them through the office or obedience of their sponsor. In no other sense can he be called a surety. For any thing, therefore, that appears to the contrary in Mr. Stone's arguments, we hold one strong text in Heb. vii. 22. "By so much was Jesus made the surety of a better testament."

The comparison is here made between him, and the Aaronical priests, who were sponsors for the people, answering for them to a holy God; and by sacrifice entering by blood within the veil, to receive for them answers of peace from the Lord. But Jesus our high priest was surety or sponsor for us in a higher sense, as he answered for our sins by the sacrifice of himself; and having entered into the holiest of all by his own blood, he hath obtained eternal redemption for us.

Whatever scripture implies an interference of Christ as mediator to secure the favor of God to sinners, serves to establish the doctrine of suretyship and substitution. And this is obviously taught in the following scriptures, and many more which might be added. Heb. viii. 6. and ix. 15. and xii. 24. 1 Pet. ii. 24. and iii. 18.

It is sneeringly said, of the doctrine of suretyship, "This is the nail which is thought to be fastened in a sure place;" p. 7.—Yes sir, this nail is fastened in a sure place, and mocks the puny attempts you make to

draw it. Secure in its place, and firm in its tenure, it defies the force of your instrument, and smiles at the feebleness of the arm which wields it.

Sect. 4. What Mr. Stone advances under the article *imputed righteousness*, (page 7, 8.) would merit no attention, did he not appear to calculate so exultingly on the force of his own reasoning.—To shew "the force of his reasoning," and estimate with as much precision as possible, its exact momentum, let it stand in the logical form of argument:

1. *The law of God requires sinners to love him with all their heart, and their neighbors as themselves.* Granted.

2. *But Christ their surety has paid their debt of obedience in their room and stead; he must mean to rescind their obligation to law, if he mean any thing at all*—And this I deny.

3. *Therefore he has freed them from the obligation of loving God or their neighbor.*

Now it is easy to see, that the reasoner has marched on to his conclusion, by assuming a principle which no person had ever granted, and which he had not proven the advocates for imputed righteousness ever held. The principle assumed, is, *that the obedience of a moral surety or mediator, releases the persons to whom it relates from all obedience to law.* When we admit such an idea as he seems to attach to suretyship, he may try the force of his reasoning upon us, but till then we will have no reason to dread its power. Mr. S. evidently labors under a confusion of ideas in writing on this subject. Treating of our obligation to law, he uniformly does it under the notion of debt and money payment; whereas no two things are more clearly distinguishable than moral justice and pecuniary justice. Though it be true that a person is released from obligation to law in case

Vide Æschylus in Sempriere

of debt, when a ſurety has paid to his creditor the money he owed, it will not neceſſarily follow, that he can be abſolved from moral obligation, becauſe a ſponſor or mediator has rendered ſuch worthy ſervices with reſpect to him, that he is relieved not only from civil pain, but capacitated to obey the law, and riſe to the higheſt honors in government. The ſtory of ~~Aminias~~ Aeschylus is very much to my purpoſe. He was on the point of being condemned to death for ~~a very ſerious offence~~ impetus expressions in his plays ~~againſt his government~~ — ~~Eubylus~~ Amynias his brother, a brave and gallant ſoldier, who had rendered many important ſervices to his country, and loſt one of his hands in a recent victory, was tenderly affected with his ſituation, and appearing in court as an an advocate, lifted up the mutilated arm in their preſence, but uttered not a word. An action ſo expreſſive and moving, deeply impreſſed the judges, and the unhappy priſoner was acquitted.* Was ~~Aminias~~ Aeschylus who was thus releaſed from puniſhment, on account of his brother's merit, and dumb but eloquent mediation, freed from all obligation to the laws of his country? Or was the law made void by this tranſaction? It cannot be ſaid. Neither is the ſinner who is ſaved from wrath on account of Chriſt's obedience and interceſſion, freed from obligation to the divine law; nor is that law made void through the benevolent interpoſition of this friend, who ſticketh cloſer than a brother.

The author thinks it impoſſible for Jeſus Chriſt to fulfil the law for ſinners, becauſe "As God, he muſt love himſelf infinitely; and as Man, he muſt love God with all his heart, and his neighbor as himſelf." And this being granted, he aſks, "What ſurplus righteouſneſs is left to be imputed to another?" Such a view of the ſubject is remote from the point in debate. The queſtion is not what Jeſus muſt do as God, or what he

---

* Flavel's Fountain of life opened—Sermon 13.

muſt do as man in a ſeparate and detached ſenſe, but what he muſt do in his compound character, as God-man, or Mediator. It ſhould have been enquired, whether the law of God had any claim of perſonal obedience upon Chriſt as God-man, which he was bound to anſwer for himſelf, without reference to ſinners? Whether a voluntary unobliged obedience to law, with reſpect to others, does not poſſeſs merit? Whether the obedience of one, on whom the law had no demand as to perſonal obligation, and which is in its nature ſupremely excellent from the dignity of the perſon making it, may not be ſet to the account of others, and they on that conſideration, placed in a new, happy, and honorable ſituation? Theſe enquiries have not been made by the author; and after all his formality and pomp of argument, he has never glanced at the true ſpirit of the queſtion. I can very readily ſee how the Saviour is deprived of merit on Mr. Stone's principle, of his doing juſt what he ſhould have done, and no more; for Chriſt himſelf has taught us to ſay, after we have done all thoſe things which are commanded, "We are unprofitable ſervants: we have done that which was our duty to do."* But I cannot ſee how, on that view of things it could have been predicted of him, "He will magnify the law and make it honorable."† Does law receive glory and honor from the obedience of its ſubjects? If it does, it will alſo be diſgraced and tarniſhed by their diſobedience, which would be ridiculous to imagine. A law intrinſically excellent, can derive no luſtre from the obedience of ſubjects, and no diſhonor from their infraction of its precepts. Immutable and glorious like its author, the law of God will ſhine as brightly in damning tranſgreſſors, as in the government of angels. Thus we ſee how mr. S. would degrade the Saviour, by making him an "unprofitable ſervant;" and reproach the law of God, in order to make the doctrine

---

* Luke xvii. 10. † Iſai. xlii. 21.

of imputed righteouſneſs, odious and contemptible. Where did he get his monſtrous notion of "ſurplus righteouſneſs," as if there could be no imputation on any other pirnciple? Or where did he learn the ſilly meaning which he tacks to "merit" and "meritorious," as if they muſt be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe, with "works of ſupererogation?" Not in any dictionary of our language, or in the writings of ſyſtematics; not in the Confeſſion of faith, or Catechiſms of our church; not in the deciſions of General Aſſemblies, Synods, and Aſſociations in Europe or America,* as he appears to know very little of all theſe; and might have been very much improved every way by a more intimate acquaintance with them. Moſt probably he collected it amidſt the rubbiſh of Rome, and now very modeſtly attemps to put it under the ſkirt of proteſtants, and charge them with the theft.

Perhaps I am wrong in charging the author with having commerce with the Imperial City. It is not at all improbable that he derives his notion of ſurplus righteouſneſs and extra-merit, from the works of Morgan, a ſubtle and plauſible deiſt of the laſt century; who under the maſk of chriſtianity, attempted its utter ſubverſion, and degraged the character and offices of Jeſus Chriſt, by placing him in the ſame claſs with Confucius, Zoroaſtre and Mahomet. I have read his Moral Philoſopher, and there ſee almoſt every argument which Mr. S. uſes againſt the doctrines of imputed righteouſneſs, and the atonement of Jeſus. That I bring no improper charge againſt him, will appear from a few extracts: "That the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, or the *redundancy of his merit*, could not be placed to our ac-

---

* Some Divines have ſpoken of a ſurpluſage in Chriſt's righteouſneſs with reſpect to its accidents, calling it *meritum ſuperlegale*; but with reſpect to its ſubſtance, which was to be imputed for juſtification, they ſuppoſed it to be juſt what it ſhould be, and no more. See Flavel's Works, vol. i. p. 204; on Merit and Meritorious.

count, ſo as to make any part of our juſtifying righteouſneſs, in the ſight of God, ſeems farther evident from hence, that all that was done or ſuffered by him, was neceſſary to himſelf, and *upon his own account*—Now here certainly could be no ſuch thing as *supererogation, or redundant merit*, where nothing was done or ſuffered, but under an indiſpenſable perſonal obligation."*

Mr. S. and his deluded followers congratulate themſelves upon having burſt into a world of light which never before bleſſed the eye of man, and affect great commiſſeration for the reſt of mankind, who are, they ſay, groping in the darkneſs of ignorance and prejudice. The light however which they boaſt, is that which "leads to bewilder, and dazzles to blind"—It is the very ſame which has illuminated the page of error, and infidelity in every age, as might be eaſily ſhewn, did the compaſs allotted to theſe ſtrictures permit a general review of paſt opinions. As the author appears from the preface and concluſion of his pamphlet, to think himſelf inſulted by the name of deiſm, I will ſometimes take occaſion to ſhew the ground on which the imputation is founded.

Sect. 5. In page 9, 10—Mr. S. with his uſual dexterity, dreſſes up a beggarly thing, "a tattered ſyſtem," for the doctine of Chriſt's ſubſtitution, and thought, no doubt that every body muſt be frightened at it! He reaſons thus; Chriſt did not ſuffer natural death in the room of ſinners, becauſe all men die—He did not ſuffer ſpiritual death for them, becauſe then he would have been a ſinner—Nor did he ſuffer eternal death for them, becauſe he roſe again from the dead, and liveth for ever more. All this parade of argument is but an artful attempt to change the face of the queſtion, and miſlead the unwary. Whoever ſaid that

* Moral Phil. vol. i. p. 153, 154.

Chriſt paid our debt of ſuffering in kind; or that as a ſubſtitute he ſuffered death, or any thing elſe, in a ſtrict and literal ſenſe as ſinners do? None. Whoever ſuppoſed that our releaſe from ſpiritual death, aroſe from an actual transfer of ſin, or evil qualities to him as our ſubſtitute? None. Or whoever aſſerted that he ſuffered eternal death, or went to hell for ever, in the room and ſtead of ſinners to ſave them? None but Mr. Stone, and thoſe who revile the croſs; and they are welcome to be as pompous and logical; as witty and profane as they pleaſe on the ſubject. Chriſtians diſtinguiſh between ſin and its curſe; between hell and the ſacrifice of Jeſus, and are therefore chargeable with none of the abſurdities which are ſo illiberally ſaid to ariſe out of their doctrine. It would be very well if the author, who is moſt religiouſly oppoſed to creeds, would ſpare himſelf the trouble of drawing up articles of faith for others, to which they feel no diſpoſition to ſubſcribe.

Sect. 6. To eſtabliſh his favorite doctrine of forgiveneſs, without reference to the Saviour's merit or ſuffering; Mr. Stone found it indiſpenſable to ſet aſide the common tranſlation of Eph. iv. 32. "Forgiving one another, even as God, for Chriſt's ſake hath forgiven you." The tranſlation which he propoſes is this: "Forgiving one another, even as God in Chriſt (en Chriſto) hath forgiven you." He adds, "Why our tranſlators rendered this phraſe *en Chriſto*, "for Chriſt's ſake" in this place only, when every where elſe they give the literal tranſlation, I pretend not to ſay." P. 11. To ſhew that what is here aſſerted by the author, as to our tranſlators "every where elſe giving the literal tranſlation," is not true, I will beg the attention of the reader to a few inſtanees in the 1ſt and 2nd chapters of 2 Peter i. 4; en epithumia, through luſt—5. *en* te piſtoi umon, *to* your faith, 2. 1. *en* to lao, *among* the people—*en* umin *among* you—7. *en* aſelgeia anaſtrophes, *with* the filthy converſation. Here on a ſingle leaf of the Teſtament we ſee our tranſlators depart

from what is said to be the literal rendering; and translate the word *through*, *to*, *among*, and *with*. And more than twice the number of instances might be taken from the same place. Any one who is able to look into a Greek Lexicon, knows that the word is capable of expressing various relations; and among others, that which it is supposed to do by the translators. That the rendering is correct, appears also from this, that the word is frequently used for *eis* and *dia*, both which signify *for the sake of*, *on account of*; and from the manner in which the same idea is generally expressed in scripture* How much confidence should be reposed in the critical abilities of the author, is discoverable in the very first trial of his skill: and I trust the plain unlettered reader will give himself no uneasiness as to the correctness of our translation, but go on to quote the text as formerly, when ever he is assailed by those who are hardy enough to deny the doctrine of forgiveness through Christ. And to assist him, I will introduce another, no less plain and pertinent; which he may defy criticism to wrest or torture. 1 John ii. 12. "I write unto you, little children, because your *sins are forgiven you for his name's sake*:" that is for the name's sake of Jesus Christ the righteous, the advocate with the Father, who is mentioned in the first verse, and plainly referred to, in most of the intervening verses. The same doctrine is also taught in these passages: "Be it known unto you, men and brethren, that *through this man*† is preached unto you, *the forgiveness of sins*. And *by him* all that believe *are justified from all things*—Neither is there salvation;" that is the pardon of sin, as well as every other blessing "in any other: for there is none other name given among men whereby we must be saved. For this is my blood

---

* See Schrevilius, Scapula, Hedericus upon the word.

† Dia Touton; for the sake of this person.

of the New Teſtament, ſhed for many, *for the remiſſion of ſins* In whom we have redemption *through his blood; the forgiveneſs of ſins*, according to the riches of his grace—In whom we have redemption *through his blood*, even the *forgiveneſs of ſin*."*

The Lord Jeſus Chriſt in delivering to Paul the doctrine of the Sacred Supper, calls that gracious covenant which promiſes forgiveneſs, and every ſpiritual bleſſing, "The New Teſtament in his own blood." 1 Cor. xi. 25. Expiatory blood is the very principle upon which the covenant or teſtament of mercy reſts; the figurative blood under the Patriarchal and Moſaic diſpenſations; and under the evangelical one the blood of Jeſus. The mercy ſeat where God remitted ſin, and delivered anſwers of peace to the people, was ſprinkled with blood to denote that he could not pardon ſin, or commune with ſinners in any other way.† "For the life of the fleſh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your ſouls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the ſoul."‡ And the forgiveneſs of ſin proceeded upon the principle of a ſpecific atonement being made to God.**

So under the goſpel, Jeſus Chriſt as the object of faith was, "ſet forth to be a propitiation," *a mercy ſeat*,‖ ſprinkled with his own blood, to diſplay the righteouſneſs or juſtice of God in the forgiveneſs of ſins. "To declare his righteouſneſs for the remiſſion of ſins that are paſt, through the forbearance of God." The moſt glorious diſplay is given of the juſtice and rectitude of the divine adminiſtration in this method of diſpenſing pardon, as the righteous and equitable de-

---

* Acts iv. 12, 13, 38, 39. Matt. xxvi. 28. Eph i. 7. Col. i. 14. † See Exod. xxv. 17—22. ‡ Lev. xvii. 11.

** See the 4th and 5th chapters of Leviticus.

‖ So the Greek word Haſterion ſignifies.

mands of the law have all been answered at the evangelical mercy-seat. And it is clearly taught, that God cannot be just or righteous on any other principle in the remission of sins. "To declare, I say at this time, his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus."* Hence we are said to be justified by his blood, and through it to find access into the holiest of all.

This, and only this, is the gospel doctrine of forgiveness. What Mr. S. advances on the subject, is an evident departure from Christian principle, and falls in precisely with the theories of Herbert, Morgan and other deistical writers—That I do not misrepresent the case, take a quotation from Morgan, who every where argues that forgiveness proceeds upon the principle of God's essential mercy, and the penitence of the sinner. Speaking of Christ's vicarious obedience as unnecessary to pardon, he says, "I hope you will not say, contrary to all the declarations of God, that he could not *pardon sin*, and *accept the penitent, returning sinner*, without a prior satisfaction made: since this must deprive him of his natural, essential goodness and mercy, and lay the whole obligation somewhere else."† These are "the green pastures of gospel truth," to which this shepherd leads his flock!

Sect. 7. It is contended (p. 10, 11, 12,) that surety-righteousness destroys the very idea of grace and forgiveness. Here again we meet the deception which the author practices upon the reader to mislead him by confounding moral justice with pecuniary justice. No two ideas are more distinctly marked in common opinion and in scripture, than those of our obligation to a creditor, who demands money, and our responsibility to criminal law, which claims the life of offenders—The

---

* Roman. iii. 25, 26. † Moral Philosopher, p. 243.

ſcriptures do ſometimes, though not very often, treat of ſin as a debt, and our releaſe from it, under the notion of payment; but then it is always done in a figurative manner, and the meaning or principal idea is to be ſought for, in ſome ſtrong point of reſemblance, without attending minutely to every part of the deſcription. The ſcope of that beautiful allegory, Matt. xviii. which Mr. Stone quotes ſo partially, is to teach us, that unleſs we forgive our offending, but penitent brethren, we cannot expect forgiveneſs from God—When we have gotten this inſtruction from it, we ſhould be ſatisfied, and not attempt to draw as this author does, ſpecial and definite doctrines from detached parts of the allegory. Becauſe no ſurety is mentioned in this caſe of forgiving a debt, he infers that no ſurety is neceſſary between God and ſinners; as if they ſuſtained no relation to him, but that of debtors. Upon the ſame plan of interpreting ſcripture, I can prove that no ſurety ſhould ever be taken in any caſe, and I make the inference on the ſame principle with Mr. Stone, that is, of there being no mention made of any; or that if there be one, the debt ſhould never be forgiven, as it is here ſaid to have been forgiven without any—Again, I might prove from v. 34th, that if my ſervant or tenant owe me money, and has treated thoſe indebted to him with ſeverity, he ſhould be put to torture till the whole debt were paid; and what is ſtill more ſhocking to the author's notion of things, I ſhould feel *wrath*; yes *wrath* when I ſentenced the unhappy wretch to theſe ſufferings. "And his Lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he ſhould pay all that was due unto him." What whimſies may not be invented, what errors may not be broached, what blaſphemies may not be uttered under the ſanction of ſcripture, if allegory and figure may be made the baſis of doctrine? The true ſtate of the ſinner is, that of a criminal to juſtice, lying under ſentence of death; and the real ſtate of the queſtion is, whether a righteous God can forgive ſin, without reference to the ſatisfaction of a mediator. As Mr. S. has not taken up the

ſubject on this principle, but varied it to a new and figurative form, and juſtified the calumny of Paine, who aſſerts that "the theory of redemption has for its baſis, an idea of pecuniary juſtice, and not of moral juſtice."* I think it improper to remark particularly on what he introduces in that ſhape. The whole falls by its own weight, when its baſis metaphor is removed.

Sect. 8. The doctrine of ſurety-righteouſneſs we are told, "confirms two contrary doctrines, which are equally falſe, viz. univerſal ſalvation, and univerſal damnation;" p. 12. Theſe reſults, contrary as they are, can be eaſily obtained in the uſual ſtyle of the authors's logic; by drawing certain concluſions from doubtful or unallowed premiſes. His firſt argument will ſtand thus: 1ſt. Chriſt taſted of death for all men, according to ſeveral ſcriptures. 2d. There is not a text in the Bible, which ſays, he did not die for all. 3. It follows with certainty, that he did die for all. No it does not follow with certainty, becauſe the firſt propoſition is denied by far the largeſt part of proteſtants, who ſay that the words *all*, *every*, *the whole world*, and the like, cannot be explained as meaning any thing different from the *many*, *the elect*, *the ſheep*, *the church*, and phraſes of that kind (which exceed the former in the proportion of ten to one,) becauſe the *terms all*, *every*, *and world*, are in moſt places, neceſſarily reſtricted, and becauſe both ſcripture and fact, conſpire to prove that Jeſus Chriſt did not die for all men in ſuch a ſenſe, as that all men will infallibly be ſaved. That he died for all who are, or will be ſaved, we know with certainty, as fact and ſcripture both prove it; but that he died in a ſtrict and poſitive ſenſe for thoſe who never deſired nor got an intereſt in his death, and with regard to whom it had been foreſeen from eternity, that they would not believe, I do not know on what ground any man can take upon him to aſſert.

---

* Age of Reaſon, firſt part, p. 59.

The next ſtep in the argument is ſtill more glaring—That its fallacy may appear, let it ſtand in his own words, thus; 1. He died for all—2. If he died for all men as ſurety in the way of ſatisfaction—3d. It undeniably follows, that all muſt be ſaved." What a charming piece of logic is here! The firſt branch of the dilemma, he confeſſes himſelf is conteſted; the 2d. is introduced with an *if*, and then lo! the concluſion undeniably follows.

Thus he proves univerſal ſalvation; let us now ſee how he can get univerſal damnation. I will again propoſe his argument in his own words:

1. "As Chriſt could not ſuffer more than infinite, "then all his ſufferings only ſatisfied law and juſtice, "and could do no more;

2. "For ſins under the goſpel there can be no for-"giveneſs, becauſe there is no ſatisfaction made for "them;

3. "Therefore all, who have ever committed one "of thoſe ſins, muſt be damned without remedy." And this proves univerſal damnation, does it? It only proves that all who had committed certain ſins, would be damned. As the greateſt part of mankind never heard the goſpel, and could never be guilty of ſins under it; and as many who believed when they firſt heard it, I would be obliged, though I admitted the premiſes, which I do not, to draw juſt the oppoſite concluſion, that all will not be damned. But the idea contained in the premiſes, that ſins under the Goſpel are not to be recognized and condemned by the law, is indeed the moſt curious poſition I have ever ſeen taken in Divinity—as if the law, which extends to every motion of our ſouls, and every action of our lives, and demands the univerſal perfection of our nature, did not notice every ſin, and condemn the ſinner committing it.

Sect. 9. Mr. S. thinks the doctrine of Christ's suffering as surety, is contrary to justice. "Every person that is not misled by a favorite system, knows that it is unjust for the innocent to suffer in the room and stead of the guilty. No just law can demand it, or admit of it. The law of God does not demand it, does not admit of it. If the Divine law admitted proxy suffering, and proxy satisfaction, then it admitted Christ's death, consequently he died according to law." p. 15. 16.

That it may be seen how exactly the quotation now made, corresponds with the objections of infidels, I will quote a few sentences from a writer of that cast. "Moral Justice cannot take the innocent for the guilty, even if the innocent would offer itself. To suppose justice to do this, is to destroy the principle of its existence, which is the thing itself. It is then no longer justice. It is indiscriminate revenge—According to him" [Paul] "there are two Adams; the one sins in fact, and suffers by proxy; the other who sins by proxy and suffers in fact."*

I am glad to see Mr. Stone step into open day, and strike where he can be seen. Hitherto he had lain concealed, and stabbed the doctrine of redemption, under the figure of debtor and creditor, or money surety; but here he comes into the sight, and boldly adopts the sentiments, and almost the language of Thomas Paine: Alas! how is Jesus wounded in the house of his professed friends, who, while they greet him with "hail master," betray him into the hands of sinners! How is the sacred cross insulted in the very sanctuary of God! "It is unjust for the innocent to suffer in the room and stead of the guilty"—How flatly does the author give the lie to the Apostle, who has said, "Christ hath once suffered for sin, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God."† That the innocent should suffer for

* Age of Reason. pt. 1st, p. 54. 60. † 1. Pet. iii. 18.

the guilty, contrary to his will, and without any proſpect of reformation in the perſon, for whom he ſubſtitutes himſelf, would be wrong, becauſe then a virtuous life would be loſt to ſociety, a miſchievious one preſerved, and the object of juſtice wreſted from it. But if the innocent voluntarily ſubſtitutes himſelf for the guilty, and that with a certainty of procuring the penitence of thoſe, for whom he ſuffers; if he poſſeſs the power of ſelf-reſurrection, and when he dies could riſe from the dead —would ſuch a caſe be contrary to juſtice, or repugnant to law? If it were, then law and juſtice would be at variance with benevolence, and oppoſe the admiſſion of much good into ſociety, which we know can never happen. This is the preciſe view which we are to take of redemption in the blood of Jeſus, by which, millions of guilty beings are recovered to virtue and happineſs, while the univerſe has ſuſtained no loſs, and the benevolent being who ſubſtituted himſelf for them, has received no injury, but reigns on high, Lord of all.

But if the principle which this author endeavours to eſtabliſh, in oppoſition to the ſatisfaction of Chriſt for ſinners, viz: that it is unjuſt for the innocent to ſuffer for the guilty, be admitted, it will be hoſtile to his own ſcheme.—He contends, that the Jewiſh victims were ſlain to awaken penitence in the mind of the worſhipper, and what is this but the innocent dying for the guilty? The deſign of Chriſt's ſuffering and dying was, he ſays, to give a diſplay of the love of God, and move the hearts of men to love and repentance. Can this be called any thing elſe than the innocent ſuffering for the guilty? How then has Mr. S. helped the matter, ſince his doctrine makes thouſands of innocent, unoffending animals bleed for the impious and wicked; and teaches, that the moſt pure and glorious beings in the univerſe muſt ſuffer, and die for the inſtruction of the guilty—*Indeed his view of Chriſt's appointment* and ſuffering, is clogged with much greater difficulties than the one he rejects; becauſe that the innocent ſuf-

fer where there is *no guilt*, either *personal* or *imputed*; which is to me one of the most shocking ideas imaginable. To designate the noblest, the purest, the most exalted being, to long and severe sufferings, as God did his own son; to expose him as a victim, on which malice might wreak its revenge, and hell exhaust its fury, shocks every idea of justice or benevolence. That sinful man should suffer the punishment due to his sins, is just; but that a pure being who had never sinned, and who was never so related to sinners, as to incur the penalty of sin for them, should be sent into the world to suffer, is horrid doctrine. We shiver with horror, when we read of parents offering up with merciless hands, their tender smiling infants, in sacrifice to idols. But how much better does this doctrine make the Almighty Father, who consigns his Son to a suffering life of thirty-three years, and to an excruciating, infamous, and even execrable death? I cannot write the horrid things which strike my mind on this aspect of Deity! Further, it may be safely affirmed to be impossible, for a perfectly pure and innocent being to feel misery. Can God suffer? Can angels suffer pain without sin? None will affirm it—How then can Jesus who is greater than angels, feel the most exquisite torture? No, it would have been physically impossible for the first, the the most cherished and glorious personage in heaven to have borne pain and infamy, when there was no personal guilt, nor the imputation of any to him, as the representative of sinners. To admit this idea, would be to abandon the first principle of moral truth, that vice and misery, virtue and happiness are inseparably connected.

The objection I am now considering would lead to atheism, as it lies equally against natural religion, which as well as christianity, requires the innocent to suffer for the guilty. "For the world is a constitution or system, whose parts have a mutual reference to each other; and is a scheme of things gradually carrying on, called the course of nature, to the carrying on

of which God has appointed us in various ways to contribute. And when in the course of natural providence, it is appointed that the innocent people should suffer for the faults of the guilty, this is liable to the very same objection as the instance we are now considering. Nay if there were any force at all in the objection, it would be stronger in one respect against natural providence than against christianity; because under the former, we are in many cases commanded and even necessitated, whether we will or not, to suffer for the faults of others—whereas the sufferings of Christ were voluntary."* So naturally does every departure from evangelical truth conduct the mind to the rejection of all religion.

I can see nothing contrary to the best feelings of our nature in the christian doctrine of the innocent suffering for the guilty. To whom does history devote her fairest page, eloquence her warmest tribute, and poetry her sweetest strains? Is it not to those men, who, under the impulse of a generous patriotism and a warm enthusiasm for liberty have devoted themselves to certain death for the good of their country? Every person is charmed with the high merit of Codrus, Curtius, Eustace de St. Pierre, and many more who have become martyrs for the safety of their country. Every person feels nature stir within him when he hears Judah in a strain of the most pathetic eloquence that ever burst from a bleeding heart, plead for Benjamin's release and his father's comfort, at the price of his own liberty. And none can be unfeeling that hears David vent the anguish of a father's soul, on learning the fate of a rebellious child; O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom: would God I had died for thee, O Absalom my son, my son." And shall not the inimitable merit of Jesus, who gave his life a ransom for millions, be reviewed

* Butler's Analogy, p. 256.

without admiration and raptures? Shall we be men every where elſe but in religion? Shall we cavil when we ſhould exult? Far otherwiſe is it with thoſe who have felt the efficacy of his death, in every quarter of the earth, and with the armies in glory.

> One ſong employs all nations; and all cry
> "Worthy the Lamb, for he was ſlain for us."

Mr. Stone imagines that if Jeſus died in the room of ſinners, "the Jews in putting him to death were not guilty of murder"—Certainly they were, becauſe they felt malice and meditated his death; that was murder in the eye of the divine law—"Whoſoever hateth his brother is a murderer." To ſay that the Jews did actually put him to death betrays great ignorance of the crucifixion, and the exiſting ſtate of things. They were a ſubjected people, and had not at that time the power of life and death. The Roman governor condemned Jeſus, and Roman ſoldiers crucified him. They alſo guarded the croſs and the tomb.

In page 34, Mr. S. reſumes the ſubject, and aſſerts that "Paul charged the devil with the murder of Chriſt." The notion of the devil's killing the Saviour, is the counterpart to that of his getting his blood. The one harmonizes with the other. And it is very remarkable, that he proves, or thinks he proves them both by the ſame text. Heb. ii. 14. "Foraſmuch then as the children were partakers of fleſh and blood, he alſo himſelf likewiſe, took part of the ſame: that through death he might deſtroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil."

I can ſee nothing like a charge of murder in the paſſage—Murder is not even named or implied, but the overthrow of Satan's power and empire. No doubt the devil ardently wiſhed the death of Chriſt, and would have felt a malignant joy in finding his own power prevalent over him. He then would have found

Jeſus the weak being he had hoped to ſee him, and which Mr. Stone's doctrine makes him. In this, however the fiend was diſappointed. Something more was found on the croſs than mere man. One who inſtead of dying by the onſet of hell, died in another way; and thus through death deſtroyed him who held the empire of death, and was now vainly expecting a triumph. Had the power of the devil, or outrages of Jews, at his inſtance, killed the Saviour, there would have been practical proof of the ſuperiority of the diabolical power, and of the complete dominion of the prince of death over him for three days. What can the enemies of Chriſt want more than to have him given to the devil a weak, degraded victim, to his power and malice. Nothing is more plain from the narrative of the crucifixion, than that Jeſus did not die in conſequence of bodily pain upon the croſs. Death was not ſo early a conſequence of crucifixion as to have been effected in the time at which Jeſus expired, being about ſix hours. Two or three days were requiſite for the extinction of life in perſons who died in that lingering way. A circumſtance which the Jews provided againſt when they beſought Pilate to give liberty to break his legs, and the legs of thoſe who were crucified with him. Great languor, weakneſs, and particularly a faltering feebleneſs of voice will always precede death, when it ſupervenes from loſs of blood and intenſe pain. Very different however, was the exit of Jeſus. His ſtrength was firm and entire, and his vigor remained freſh in him to his laſt moment. Though he fainted on his way to Golgotha, yet on the croſs no ſymptoms of weakneſs or languor are ſeen, no feeble interrupted ſighs are heard from his dying lips. Several facts inconteſtibly prove this—ſuch as his addreſs to a company of ſympathiſing females, who wept near his croſs—his prayer for his murderers—his converſation with the penitent thief—his addreſs to his mother and John—his exclaiming with a loud voice *Eloi, Eloi Lama Sabaithani*—the cry "It is finiſhed"—and at the very moment of diſſolution his crying with a loud

voice. Thus Jeſus, while natural ſtrength was ſtil
green in him, and when earth and hell had exhauſte
their fury in vain, made the ſolemn ſurrender of life
on behalf of ſinners. As God, he offered up his human
ſoul and body on the altar of Jehovah, for the expiation
of ſin. None but God could make ſuch an offering;
becauſe none but God had a right to diſpoſe of life.
"Therefore doth my father love me, becauſe I lay down
my life, that I might take it up again." It was divine
power which Jeſus exerted in taking up life, or riſing
from the dead, as all muſt confeſs, and by that very pow-
er it was, he laid down his life. "No man taketh i
from me, but I lay it down of myſelf."—Does this look
like Mr. S's. idea, that Jews and the dogs of hell to
his life away, and made him the feeble, degrade
victim of their infuriate vengeance? No, thanks t
God for theſe plain words, "No man taketh it from
me, but I lay it down of myſelf."—The ſurrender wa
free, unconſtrained and godlike. The offering of Chri
was made, we are aſſured, Heb. ix. 14. by the eterna
ſpirit, or divine power. "I have power to lay it down
and I have power to take it again. This command
ment have I received of my Father."* This layin
down of life, and taking it again, was in obedience to
poſitive command of God. Upon this principle did th
Saviour engage for ſinners, in that memorable compac
with the Father. "Then ſaid I lo, I come: in th
volume of the book it is written of me: I delight t
do thy will, O my God; yea, thy ALW is in my heart."
That theſe words reſpect the ſacrifice of Jeſus upo
the croſs, is evident, from its being contraſted with th
legal ſacrifices, "Sacrifice and offering thou didſt no
deſire," and from the comment of the Apoſtle upo
this paſſage, where the ſacrifice of Jeſus for ſins is ſai
to ſupercede the ſacrifices under the law. Heb. x. 5
—12. The ſame doctrine is taught in Phil. ii. 8. "H

---

* John x. 17. 18. † Pſalm xl. 7. 8.

humbled himself, and became *obedient* unto death, even the death of the cross." Thus it is seen, that in dying he obeyed the *commandment*, *will* and *law* of the father. But plain as all this is, Mr. Stone has the temerity to assert, "the law of God does not demand it, does not admit of it." While the humble christian relies upon the obedience of Jesus, as possessing precious worth, this daring man presumes upon the mercy of God, and makes the blood of the cross a vain thing. The Scriptures frequently speak of the Saviour's priesthood, and the sacrifices which he made to God by death; but according to Mr. S's. hypothesis, the Jews and the devil are raised into the ghostly characters of priests, as they slay the Lamb of God, and offer him upon the cross! A charming priesthood indeed.

Prophecy, which paints with circumstantial exactness, the death of Messiah informs us, that *it pleased the Lord to bruise him, and put him to grief.* Isai. liii. 10. That remarkable address to Jehovah, concerning the sacrifice of Christ, *when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin*, is very express; nor less so is the promise made to Messiah, and the ground on which it was to be accomplished—"He shall see of the *travail of his soul*, and be satisfied; because he HATH poured out his soul unto death."

Mr. S. asks, whether "God himself did actually bruise or kill his own Son?" If by bruise or kill, be meant to take life violently, and without authority, I say no: but if by bruise or kill, be understood to take life by right, and according to strict justice, in a case where it is freely surrendered, I answer yes. That Jehovah who is the giver of life to every creature, and to the man Christ Jesus, as well as others, should dispose of his life, and the life of every creature, has nothing in it repugnant to right reason.

The author with his usual adroitness, endeavours to weaken the testimony of Zech. xiii. 7. "Awake, O

ſword, againſt my ſhepherd, and againſt the man that is my fellow, ſaith the Lord of hoſts; ſmite the ſhepherd, and the ſheep ſhall be ſcattered."

"Tradition has ſanctioned it as the truth of God, that this ſword is the *ſword of juſtice*." p. 35.

What tradition Sir? Where is it? How long has it rolled down the current of time? Is it written or oral? —Mr. S. and every diſorganiſing ſpirit exclaims againſt tradition, and under that leveling, undefined name, would confound every thing.

"But there is not a hint in the Bible of juſtice being ever called a ſword." (ibid.)

Thus the author ſhifts his ground, and varies his point of retreat from the difficulty. He firſt abuſes a tradit'onary ſomething, which he names the ſword of juſtice, and then ſpeaks of *juſtice called a ſword*. Is the *ſword of juſtice* the ſame thing with *juſtice called a ſword?* No more the ſame than the ſword and the hand which brandiſhes it. This way of getting rid of a difficulty, has very much the air of chicanery and trick. But indeed I do not blame him. The paſſage had a frowning aſpect, and threw ſuch glances of vengeance towards his doctrine, as indicated a ſtroke that might be fatal. It was therefore neceſſary to ſet it aſide in any way. To proceed; is there no hint in Scripture concerning a ſword of juſtice? What is that terrible thing which I ſee on the Eaſt of Eden? "A flaming ſword, which turned every way to keep the tree of life?"* Was that flaming ſword a ſword of juſtice, or not?—What was that which Moſes and Ezekiel ſaw glitter in the hand of Jehovah? "A ſword, a ſword whetted and furbiſhed for ſlaughter"†—What was that

---

* Gen. iii. 24. † Deut. xxxii. 41. Ezek. xxi. 28.

ſword of Iſrael's excellency, mentioned, Deut. xxxiii. 29. which ſhould cut off their enemies, and get them a glorious triumph? The Lord himſelf—Yes, Iſrael's ſhield of help, and ſword of excellency, or if the author pleaſe, a ſword of juſtice. Are theſe no hints?

But fortunately it is found, that *wicked men* are the ſword of the Lord. Pſalm xvii. 13. And it follows, does it, that they are the ſword addreſſed in this prophecy? To ſhew how flimſy the author's expoſition is, I will read the text in that way, by inſerting *wicked men* for *ſword*. "Awake, O wicked men, againſt my ſhepherd, and againſt the man that is my fellow; ſmite the ſheph rd"—What, does the Lord couſel wicked men, nay, command them to commit murder? Take care, Sir, you do not make God the author of ſin.—The Saviour expounds the words very differently. "It is written, I (not wicked men,) will ſmite the ſhepherd, and the ſheep of the flock ſhall be ſcattered abroad."‡ Who is right, Jeſus Chriſt or Mr. S.? let the reader whoſe ſoul depends upon that ſacrifice for ſin, determine.

Mr. Stone *objects to the doctrine of* God's being reconciled, "that it makes God changeable." (p. 16.)

This objection reſts upon the falſe principle that there is no wrath in God, and of courſe, that he needs no reconciliation. That God puniſhes ſin by a poſitive interpoſition, we have certain evidence; and what he does, he muſt do from principle, or ſome tendency of his nature, moving him to that action. For we can as eaſily conceive of action without an agent, as of an agent without principles of action. The principle moving Deity to puniſh ſin by a poſitive act, I call wrath; and the Scriptures not only aſſert its exiſtence, but in

‡ Matt. xxvi. 31.

deſcribing it, uſe the boldeſt images, to give us an awful impreſſion of its nature and operation. Either then, the Scriptures are deſigned to miſlead us, and excite our feelings unneceſſarily; or there does really exiſt ſuch a principle as wrath in God. The exiſtence of this principle being granted, it is plain, its operating or ceaſing to operate, produces no change in him; for a change of operation is no change of nature or principle. When God, therefore acts, or forbears to act in the puniſhment of ſin, no change of nature or principle can be inferred; both continue to be, what they have been from eternity. Thus when God forbears to act in puniſhing the ſinner, on account of the obedience and mediation of Jeſus Chriſt, he is ſaid to be reconciled; and yet in that reconciliation no change of nature or principle takes place, but only of tendency or operation. He is now the ſame that he ever was. So that this redoubted objection which meets us in every part of Mr. Stone's book, when cloſely viewed, turns out to be juſt nothing at all: like the tall ghoſt that chills the blood of the midnight traveller, it proves a fleeting harmleſs illuſion.

It cannot be grace, but debt in God to forgive our ſins, the author alledges, *if our ſurety has paid our debt* to juſtice. So Mr. Morgan had ſaid before him. "When ſatisfaction has been made, the remiſſion of the penalty muſt after that be an act of juſtice, and cannot be conſidered as an act of pardon, or an act of grace."*

The objection turns upon the old fallacy of pecuniary juſtice. It is ſtrange Mr. S. cannot drop the idea of creditor and debtor, and conſider the ſubject in a correct point of view. Does the ſuffering a civil penalty by one perſon, change the moral character of ano-

---

* Moral Philoſopher, p. 149.

ther? Certainly no—and if not, it will ſtill be grace to forgive him, tho' his ſubſtitute has ſuffered for him. Hiſtory furniſhes an inſtance to illuſtrate my meaning. Zaleucus, the Locrian Legiſlator, framed a law, by which adultery was to be puniſhed in the perſon violating it, with the loſs of both his eyes. It happened that his own ſon was convicted of the crime, and ſentenced to endure the penalty. To ſupport the dignity of the law, and yet to preſerve ſight to his ſon, the benevolent Zaleucus had one of his ſon's eyes, and one of his own put out.‡

In this caſe, the ſuffering of Zaleucus did not change the moral character of his ſon; he was ſtill criminal, tho' his father had ſuffered for him. Juſt ſo, tho' Jeſus has ſuffered as the ſinners' ſubſtitute, to meet the claims of juſtice, the moral character of the ſinner is not changed; he needs forgiveneſs, and it will be grace in God to pardon his ſins thro' the obedience of his ſurety, "In whom, we have redemption thro' his blood—the forgiveneſs of ſins according to the riches of his grace."†

The laſt objection which Mr. Stone offers to ſurety-righteouſneſs is, that "it lulls to ſupineneſs and ſlothfulneſs in religion."

It is remarkable, that every man who revolts from the plain truths of chriſtianity, never fails to reproach the doctrine of juſtification, by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, with leading to licentiouſneſs, or as Morgan phraſes it, "laying a foundation to ſupport iniquity by grace."* I cannot open the writings of any erroriſt, or infidel of any age or country, without meeting this

‡ Flavel's Works, Vol. 1, p. 109. † Eph. i. 7.

* Moral Philoſophy, Vol. 1, p. 170.

ſenſeleſs ſlander. What Mr. S. inſinuates here in terms of the moſt malignant ſarcaſm, is but the ſame unavailing calumny which has been tried again and again. Surely he muſt have been very much at a loſs for weapons to aſſail chriſtians, when he has to reſort ſo often to thoſe pointleſs ones, with which infidelity has exhauſted all its ſtrength againſt the religion of Jeſus.

" He gleans the blunted ſhafts that have recoil'd,
" And aims them at the ſhield of truth again."

It is however not a little conſoling, to find ourſelves placed in the ſame group with St. Paul, and the primative chriſtians; to whoſe doctrines the very ſame objection was offered—"Shall we continue in ſin that grace may abound?" was the queſtion in thoſe days, as well as our own. Nor is it among the leaſt proofs of our opinions being the ſame with theirs; that the ſame things are objected to ours, that were to theirs. But we deny the fact, that our views of chriſtianity lead us to ſin, that grace may abound; or make us leſs ardent in the purſuit of holineſs. We have practical proof that the objection is as unfounded, as it is illiberal. Thouſands while they conſider with as much effect as Mr. S. and his diſciples, "that without holineſs no man ſhall ſee the Lord," are truſting only upon the precious blood and righteouſneſs of Jeſus, for juſtication before God. Thouſands who have not the TEMERITY and HARDIHOOD to found their hope of heaven upon the ground of perſonal merit, are aiming at univerſal purity of nature, and perfecting holineſs in the fear of God.

"——————Then proud, poor worm,
Conceived in ſins, offending from thy youth,
In every point tranſgreſſor of the law
Of righteouſneſs, of merit towards God
Dream if thou canſt; or madman if thou art,
Stand on that plea for heaven, and be undone."

There is no doubt with me, the principles of religion which men adopt, will have a decided influence upon their habits and morals; and, if I may ſay it, the doctrines I now oppoſe, will have the greateſt poſſible tendency to lull the mind into a dangerous, if not fatal repoſe. What ſo congenial to the corrupt propenſities of the human heart, ſo ſoothing to its numerous prejudices, or ſo flattering to its vanity and preſumption as the very liberal creed of Mr. S.?—Faith and repentance are all that can be neceſſary in order to forgiveneſs, and theſe the ſinner can exerciſe at any moment he chuſes to exert his power—Men are juſtified on the ground of perſonal merit, or becauſe they are actually righteous, and not becauſe Jeſus Chriſt magnified the law, and brought in an everlaſting righteouſneſs—God is all love, and this love is fixed upon the race of Adam—the ever beaming ſtreams of infinite love flow out to every part of the univerſe, and penetrate even to the profoundeſt hell—In God there is not, nor can be any thing like wrath, vengeance or indignation, that will conſume the adverſary, or inflict pains upon bold tranſgreſſors—How far ſuch principles will go to make men holy, let thoſe decide who adopt them, and reſt the trial of eternity upon their truth; but I know a certain part of the univerſe where ſuch a creed would not find retainers—it is where the wretched inhabitants "believe and tremble."

CHAPTER II.

THE Second Letter opens with an intimation, that the former one had thrown the mind of his correſpondent, into a dreadful ſtate of confuſion. I was going to ſay with ſome indignation, he muſt have been very weak indeed, to have been confuſed, nay, dreadfully confuſed, by ſuch a production! But my eye caught the next ſentence and I think I ſmiled. "You are convinced that Calviniſm has no foundation in truth." What! conviction of the falſehood of Calviniſm, and yet the mind in a ſtate of confuſion! Conviction and confuſion, nay, dreadful confuſion in the ſame mind! A ſtrange match indeed! Then light and darkneſs may go into wedlock. I had always thought conviction of the truth or falſehood of any ſyſtem ſhould be the reſult of calm, ſedate reflection, of extenſive views of the ſubject in all its parts, connections and dependencies, and of candid, unbiaſſed compariſon of that with other ſyſtems. When there is a claſhing of thoughts and diſlocation of ideas, the mind muſt be in a very improper condition to judge whether Calviniſm be truth or falſehood, or to learn "what is truth," at the lips of the moſt admired caſuiſt. From what I know of human neture, I cannot queſtion that it is a primary object with thoſe who are fond of diſſeminating peculiar error, or favorite opinons to make their onſet in this way:

They aſſail eſtabliſhed and long cheriſhed ideas, with every art of ſophiſtry and zeal; they declaim boldly againſt the dangerous tendency and tyranny of ſuch opinions; they bid you throw off the ſlaviſh yoke of prejudice, aſſume your liberty and be happy.

Where the plan ſucceeds, the mind is thrown off its pivot, its operations are deranged, and that equipoiſe and harmony of intellectual powers, ſo neceſſary

in purſuits after truth, entirely loſt. All is confuſion! dreadful confuſion! The trembling pupil is now prepared to believe any thing. Whether Mr. Stone uſes that proceſs of proſelyting, I have no right to determine, but paſs on to hear the anſwer to the queſtion, "what is truth?"

"God and man are at TWOS"—Their natures are perfectly oppoſed one to the other—Chriſt came as mediator, to "at-one them, or make them one."* When I read the criticiſms on the words atone, and atonement, I cannot be perſuaded that the author could apply to himſelf the words of Paul: "When I became a man, I put away childiſh things." It is really a pity to ſee a man wearing the venerable character of a chriſtian miniſter, trifling as he does with the Engliſh language, and the word of God in this part of the letter. As the object of my purſuit is to attend to his theological opinions, more than his literary qualifications, I ſhall leave him to the undiſturbed poſſeſſion of his "AT-TWOS," AT-ONE, AT-ONEMENT, and attend to the doctrines raiſed from his criticiſms. "Hence it is plain that atonement differs not from regeneration." This idea is confirmed from the meaning of the word atonement under the law. There it is explained to ſignify "purging, cleanſing, moſt generally, if not always."

I will grant that, purging, cleanſing, and atonement mean the ſame thing, but will it follow that regeneration and atonement are the ſame? If they be, then according to Mr. S.'s doctrine, the altar, the leprous houſe, the book, the tabernacle, and the veſſels of the miniſtry were all regenerated. Regeneration is ſomething done in us, not ſomething done for us; but atonement was ſomething done for the perſons who enjoyed that privilege, not in them. Something by which

---

* Page 20.

wrath was averted, and purification obtained. The uſual phraſe is "the prieſt ſhall make an atonement for him, or them, and his, or their ſin was forgiven." (See Lev. iv. 20, 26, 31, 35.—v. 10, 13, 16, 18.—vi. 7.)

By "purging," it is evident the ſcriptures mean ſomething different from perſonal purity, or regeneration—Thus it is ſaid of Jeſus, "When he had by himſelf purged our ſins, ſat down on the right hand of the Majeſty on high;"* but if the word means a moral cleanſing, or change of nature, then Jeſus did not ſet down at the right hand of God, till after the regeneration of chriſtians in the apoſtles' days.

"And almoſt all things are by the law purged with blood, and without ſhedding of blood is no remiſſion." It was therefore neceſſary that the patterns of things in the heavens ſhould be purified [purged] with theſe, [ſacrifices of blood,] but the heavenly things themſelves with better ſacrifices than theſe."† From this text it is plain, moral purity cannot be intended, becauſe places and things which are ſaid to be purged, could not be the ſubjects of it, and becauſe heavenly things themſelves were purged by better ſacrifices. It muſt mean then, either to conſecrate any thing, or turn away wrath from it; in this ſenſe it can naturally and properly apply to places and things; for theſe may be ſubject to judgment, or a curſe for man's ſake; or from their connection with man, conſecration may be neceſſary. To make atonement, or purge with blood, places or things, is to do that by which wrath, or judgment is averted or prevented from falling upon them for man's ſin, or by which they are ſet apart to a ſacred uſe.

The Hebrew word kapar, which is tranſlated atone, and ſometimes purge, never ſignifies to change, regen-

* Heb. i. 3—† ix. 22, 28.

crate, or make pure; but to expiate and appeaſe. Its radical meaning is to cover any thing.* Thus it ſignifies to cover ſin, as in the following paſſages; Pſalm lxv. 3. As for our tranſgreſſions thou ſhalt purge them away (the Hebrew thou ſhalt cover, or expiate them.) Pſalm lxxix. 9. Purge away our ſins for thy name's ſake (Hebrew, cover or expiate) our ſins. (Compare Pſalm lxxx. 2.—xxxvii. 2, with Rom. iv. 7.)

More frequently it refers to the perſon of the ſinner, and ſignifies to cover him from puniſhment or ſuffering, as in Exodus xxx. 15, 16. The rich ſhall not give more, and the poor ſhall not give leſs than half a ſhekel, when they give an offering unto the Lord, to make an atonement for your ſouls. And thou ſhalt take the atonement of the children of Iſrael, and ſhall appoint it for the ſervice of the tabernacle of the congregation, that it may be a memorial unto the children of Iſrael before the Lord, to make an atonement for your ſouls; with which the reader will compare the 12th verſe. The word is uſed to expreſs the ſame idea in the 4th, 16th, 17th chapters of Leviticus, and great variety of places beſide.

The word is employed to deſcribe the atonement made by Phinehas, when he turned away the wrath of the Lord from the children of Iſrael, and ſecured to himſelf and to his ſeed, God's gracious covenant of peace.†

The reader may alſo conſult Exod. xxxii. 30. Pſalm lxxviii. 38. Jerem. xviii. 23. where the word is uſed in the ſame ſenſe. Having thus ſhewn that to atone, or make atonement, does not mean as this author ſuppoſes, to make one, or to regenerate; but to expiate ſin, or

---

* See Parkhurſt, Taylor, Robertſon, and Pagninus on the ord.

† Numb. xxv. 13, comp. verſes 11, 12.

protect the ſinner from wrath.—I now proceed to examine his notions about reconciliation.

"A hint to the learned." (p. 21.) The learned certainly will not be wanting in a ſenſe of obligation to the author for his inſtructive hint, and biblical criticiſm, will doubtleſs be enriched greatly by ſo valuable an acceſſion. "The word (katallage) rendered atonement in our tranſlation, is every where elſe in the New Teſtament rendered reconciliation." The author refers to Rom. v. 11. "By whom we have received the atonement." Well then, let it be reconciliation. "By whom we have received the reconciliation." It is then ſomething received from Chriſt, and not ſome perſonal change as Mr. S. concludes.

"Reconciliation and atonement are the ſame thing," and "atonement differs not from regeneration." What a ſtrange Judicrous aſpect would it give ſcripture, did we go on to read it with this author's gloſs. "For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled [regenerated] to God, by the death of his Son: much more being reconciled [regenerated] we ſhall be ſaved by his life." Then Paul and all the chriſtians of his time, were regenerated when they were enemies, and yet, (amazing to tell) after this regeneration, their ſalvation was yet a future thing, and to be effected by the life of Jeſus! Take one more, Col. i. 20. "And having made peace through the blood of his croſs by him, to reconcile [regenerate] all things unto himſelf, by him, I ſay, whether they be things in heaven, or things on earth, or things under the earth." By this mode of expoſition all things in heaven were enemies to God, and needed regeneration.

"In the laws of Moſes alſo, atonement, and reconciliation are ſynonymous." Yes, exactly; the word kapar is alternately rendered to make atonement and reconciliation; to atone and reconcile—but we muſt find ſome other meaning than regeneration.

"From this view of propitiation, we see that it does not differ from atonement, reconciliation, and regeneration." It is in perfect harmony with the two first, but differs widely from the last, as would appear if the place of reconciliation be supplied by regeneration. Rom. iii. 23. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation [regeneration] &c. 1 John ii. 2. And he is the propitiation [regeneration] for our sins. (iv. 10.) He loved us and sent his Son to be the propitiation, (the regeneration) for our sins; and in Hebrews ii. 17. according to this view, Jesus came to regenerate the sins of the people; *ilaskesthai tas amartias tou laau.*

"The word ilaskesthai, translated in this verse, reconciliation, is every where else in the New Testament translated propitiation. Rom. iii. 23. 1 John ii. 2.—iv. 10. p. 22." Another hint for the learned! "The word ilaskesth-i, here translated reconciliation." Stop there, it is not translated reconciliation; but as it should be, "to make reconciliation." What must the learned think of this blunder!—mistaking a *verb* for a *noun*. "Is every where else in the New Testament translated propitiation." It is not; no, indeed it is not. There is not one place in the whole New Testament where "ilaskesthai," is translated propitiation, nor can it be, for the former is a *verb*, and the latter a *noun*.

The author refers to Rom. iii. 25. 1 John ii. 2. and iv. 10. as passages in which the word is so rendered, and yet ilaskesthai, is not be found in either of these texts; but *ilasterion*, and *ilasmas*—Words which are very properly translated propitiation. I am really sorry to see Mr. Stone expose himself thus to the animadversions of the public. The only observation I shall make with respect to such lapses, is, that he would occupy the place of an humble enquirer after truth, with more propriety than the chair of a dictator, or the throne of sectarian partiality. At least it should lower that tone of confidence, with which he addresses the whole christian world, as being blind, misled by system, and ranging under the standard of the red dragon.

Were Mr. Stone as well acquainted with his Greek Teſtament as he ſhould be, he would find the very word uſed in Heb. ii. 17. in one more text, which would be fatal to the whole doctrine of his book; I mean Luke xviii. 13. "God be merciful to me a ſinner," O Theos ilaſtheti moi to amartolo, *God be propitiated to me a ſinner.* Here ſee a ſin-burdened penitent, praying his God to be propitious to his ſoul, contrary to what Mr. Stone ſays, that it is impoſſible God ſhould be propitiated or appeaſed. Who is right, Mr. S. or the publican? The publican we are very certain; becauſe this man went down to his houſe juſtified; and I moſt heartily pray the former may learn to utter the ſame prayer, with all the paſſionate emphaſis of a penitent, and like him have joy and peace in believing.

To underſtand the doctrine of propitiation more perfectly, I beg leave to obſerve, that the Hebrew noun Kaparat, derived from the word kapar, which I have before ſhewn to ſignify atone, reconcile, protect, was the name of the lid covering the ark of the covenant, made of pure gold. On this, and before it, the high prieſt was to ſprinkle the blood of the expiatory ſacrifices on the great day of atonement.* "The ſeptuagint render it, in Exod. xxv. 17. by ilaſterion epithema, a propitiatory lid or covering; but generally ilaſterion a propitiatory; by which name St. Paul alſo calls it. Heb. ix. 5. And by applying it to Chriſt, Rom. iii. 25. whom God ſet forth, ilaſterion a propitiatory or mercy-ſeat, aſſures us *that* was the true mercy-ſeat, the reality of which the *kaparat*, repreſented to the ancient believers."†

At the mercy-ſeat ſprinkled with the blood of expiation, God promiſed to meet with his people, to commune with them, and deliver anſwers of peace and mercy.‡ In Jeſus alone, who is the true mercy-ſeat, we

---

* Lev. xvi. 14, 15. † Parkhurſt. ‡ Exod. xxv. 17, 22.

draw nigh to God and die not. None who approached in any other way are accepted, but ſhare a like fate with the ſons of Aaron, who brought unhallowed incenſe before him.

As a principal object of Mr. Stone's book is, to prove that God is not the ſubject of reconciliation with ſinners, I ſhall ſubmit the following obſervations to the readers' judgment:

1. All the Jewiſh offerings for ſin were made to Deity. "Unto the Lord did the commandment require the offerings to be made, and unto the Lord was it uniformly made." Lev. i. 9, 13, 14, 17.

As the offering was made to the Lord, ſo when the ceremony was performed by faith, and according to law, "The Lord accepted it." See Lev. xxii. and compare verſes 21, 23, 25, and chap. i. 4.

A viſible token was ſometimes vouchſafed, that God did actually accept the oblation. "And the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people, and there came fire out from before the Lord, and conſumed upon the altar, the burnt offerings and the fat, which, when the people ſaw they ſhouted, and fell upon their faces." (Liv. ix. 23, 24.) This happened in the offering of Abel: for God teſtified of his gifts.

To God then was the atonement made, becauſe his altar received the ſacrifice, his prieſt offered it, and his fire conſumed it, as we have ſeen in the paſſage juſt quoted, to witneſs the acceptance of the oblation. God's all conſuming wrath fell upon the victim, and not on the ſinner. Well might the Iſraelites ſhout and fall upon their faces at ſuch a ſight.

When the offering was not accepted, the perſon, or perſons for whom it was made, bore his, or their ſin,

and punishment was inflicted.* Thus Moses prayed God not to "respect the offering of Korah, Dathan and Abiram." Fact proves their offering was not respected; sin lay heavy on their souls: Korah and his associates in rebellion, "went down alive into the pit, and the earth closed upon them; then fire came out from the Lord, and consumed the 250 priests who offered "incense" on their behalf at the door of the tabernacle."†

At the fall of these men, the children of Israel murmured against Moses and Aaron, charging them with killing the people of the Lord; like some in our day, they believed there was no wrath in God, but in man: in Moses and Aaron, and thought these men had acted very wickedly in murdering God's dear people. Ah! how many are esteemed the Lord's people, who are actually lying under his curse!

The excessive charity of the people had well nigh proven their ruin: for lo! while they assaulted the prophet, and the priest of God, his "glory appeared," and the Lord said, to Moses "Get you up from among this congregation, that I may consume them as in a moment." People should beware how they call some the people of the Lord, and quarrel with God's regularly appointed ministers, when obliged to resort to excision! "And Moses said unto Aaron, take a censer and put fire therein from off the altar, and put on incense, and go quickly unto the congregation, and MAKE AN ATONEMENT FOR THEM; for there is WRATH GONE OUT FROM THE LORD, and the plague is begun. And Aaron took as Moses commanded, and ran into the midst of the congregation, and behold the plague was begun amongst the people—he put on incense, and made an ATONEMENT FOR THE PEOPLE. And he stood between the dead, and the living, and the plague was stayed." (Num.

---

* Lev. vii. 18. † Numb. xvi. 15---35.

xvi. 41—48) The reader may compare this paſſage with 2 Sam. xxiv. 25: where David made an altar unto the Lord, and offered burnt offerings and peace offerings, "and the Lord was intreated for the land, and the plague was ſtayed from Iſrael." The hiſtory of this ſame event is ſo remarkable in another place,* that I cannot help tranſcribing it; "And David built an altar to the Lord, and offered burnt offerings and peace offerings, and called upon the Lord, AND HE ANSWERED HIM FROM HEAVEN BY FIRE upon the altar of burnt offerings. And the Lord commanded the angel, and he put up his *ſword* again in the ſheath thereof."

The plain doctrine of theſe ſcriptures is, that there was an actual expiation for ſin made to the Lord by ſacrifice, to turn away wrath from offenders, or that the offender's guilt was tranſfered to a ſubſtituted victim, and God accepting that victim releaſed the offender from puniſhment.

Whether we like it or not, this is what the word of God teaches, and I cannot doubt a moment that God is reconciled to ſinners.

2. I am led to the ſame doctrine by conſidering the peace offerings, or ſacrifices of reconciliation. Theſe were eminent types of him, whom Iſaiah ſtyles the Prince of Peace, and whom Paul by way of emphaſis ſtyles *our peace*. Offerings were profeſſedly made to avert wrath, or cover the ſinner from puniſhment. Now of theſe oblations were both God and man to partake, which proves undeniably that reconciliation was neceſſary on God's part as well as on the ſinner's.†

3. The ſacrifice of the paſſover was intended to ſhelter from wrath. With the blood of the Paſchal Lamb, were the ſide poſts and lintels of the doors of the children of Iſrael ſprinkled, and when the angel of

---

* 1 Chron. xxi. 26, 27. † Lev. iii. 6, 16—vii. 11, 27.

death passed through the land to slay the first born of Egypt, he passed over every house which was protected by the sign of peace. "For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." 1 Cor. v. 7.

4. The solemn ratification of the covenant of peace between God and Abraham recorded Gen. xv. speaks the same language. The patriarch prepared the victims according to the divine command, and divided them into equal parts, he placed the severed bleeding limbs opposite to each other, leaving a passage between them. This done, he passed through the palpitating parts himself, and waited with solemnity and composure the appearance of Deity. About dark, behold the sheckinah, or visible token of God's presence, passed between the pieces of the separated victim, as "a smoking furnace, and a burning lamp; and on that day God made a covenant with Abraham."

Thus was God's gracious covenant ratified by each party passing between the pieces. It may be remarked that this transaction had an immediate reference to Christ, because the Hebrew word Berith, here translated covenant, means a *purifier*, *a purifying victim*, or a *purification sacrifice*, and is used several times in scripture as a personal title of Jesus Christ. Isai. xlii. 5. "Give thee as a covenant [Berith] to the people;" also lxix. 8. Zech. ix. 11. As for thee also by the blood of thy covenant [Berith] &c.

Jesus Christ then was the true Berith, or purifying victim, cut off for the ratification of a treaty of peace between God and man, who hath expressed their reconciliation by passing through the Berith cut in twain.

I have thus availed myself of the evidence of the law, because I view it as typical christianity; and as giving convincing and impressive proof of the doctrine I pursue. "If ye had believed Moses, ye would have believed on me." One reason why men mistake Jesus, is because they mistake Moses.

The ceremonial obſervances were, we are taught, "the ſhadows of good things to come." The holy places made with hands were figures of the true; and according to the law, the prieſts that offered gifts, ſerved unto the example and ſhadow of heavenly things; as Moſes was admoniſhed of God when he was about to make the tabernacle. "For ſee," ſaith he, "That thou make all things according to the pattern ſhewed thee in the mount."*

All the Levitical inſtitutions, the prieſthood, the holy places and ſacrifices, were copies, or drafts, exactly taken from the heavenly tabernacle—The prieſthood and ſacrifice of Jeſus, being the originals ſhewn to Moſes in the mount.

The law of ceremonies then, was the true goſpel in copy, type, or figure, drafted from a model in the heavens, and this being ſo, the proofs which I have drawn, or may draw from that ſource, are all to carry the ſame force, as if taken from the goſpel itſelf.

5. I now proceed to obſerve, that reconciliation was neceſſary on God's part, becauſe the ſacrifice of Jeſus was made directly to God. "How much more ſhall the blood of Chriſt, who through the eternal ſpirit OFFERED HIMSELF without SPOT TO GOD, purge your conſciences from dead works; and walk in love as Chriſt alſo hath loved us, and *given himſelf for us an offering*, and a SACRIFICE TO GOD for a ſweet ſmelling ſavor."†

There we ſee that the grand original ſacrifice from which the legal ſacrifices were copied; the grand prototype or model from which they were drawn by Moſes in the mount, WAS OFFERED UP TO GOD, and we can have no difficulty in concluding that its primary de-

---

* Hebrew x. 1. viii. 45. † Heb. ix. 4. Eph. v. 2.

ſign was, to reconcile him to man, or which is the ſame thing, to turn away the wrath of an offended God from a periſhing world.

Daniel, ſpeaking of the advent of Meſſiah, and the deſign of it, ſays, "ſeventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finiſh the tranſgreſſion, and to make an end of ſins, and to make *reconciliation for iniquity*."* The reconciliation mentioned here, will be better underſtood if along with it, we take the Apoſtle's comment. "Wherefore, in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a faithful and merciful high prieſt, in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the ſins of the people."—This was a *reconciliation* made *for the ſins of the people*, and could not be any thing effected in them. It was accompliſhed by a ſacrifice and prieſt, to whom the Levitical prieſthood and ſacrifices pointed, as the object from which they derived their worth and efficacy. And as reconciliation under the law conſiſted in the averting of wrath, that made by the ſacrifice of Chriſt, muſt be exactly of the ſame nature. We are particularly guarded againſt miſtake, in contemplating this paſſage by the clauſe, "in things pertaining to God;" which intimates that what was done by our high prieſt to procure reconciliation, had an immediate reference to God, as the perſon to whom the offering was made, and who in that way was to be reconciled.

6. I now come to prove the ſame doctrine by plain, poſitive ſcriptures, which I will introduce as they occur to mind, without the formality of remark or comment. "He was bruiſed for our iniquities," and the chaſtiſement of our peace was upon him—Iſai liii. 5. Behold the man whoſe name is the BRANCH—Even

---

* Chap. ix. 24.

he shall build the temple of the Lord, and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon the throne, and he shall be a priest upon the throne, and the COUNSEL OF PEACE SHALL BE BETWEEN THEM BOTH. Zech. vi. 12, 13. Glory to God in the highest, and on earth, PEACE and GOOD WILL towards men. Luke ii. 14. Therefore, being justified by faith, we have PEACE WITH GOD THROUGH OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. Rom. v. 1. And I will establish my covenant with thee, and thou shalt know that I am the Lord: That thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more, when I am PACIFIED‡ (reconciled) toward thee for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord God. Ezek. xvi. 62, 63. Can any person who pretends to believe in inspiration read these plain texts, and venture to say God cannot be propitiated or reconciled? If he can, he is to be pitied for having denied the faith, and become more than an infidel.

Mr. Stone asks and replies, "From whom or from what did Christ redeem, &c.? I answer first, from the devil." (p. 22.)

That freedom from the bondage of satan is a fruit or consequence of redemption in Christ, is certainly true; but that his blood was shed as the price of the sinner's ransom from the devil, has no foundation in scripture. Not a single passage contains such an odious doctrine. Does any one of those texts which the author quotes, prove it? No, they all prove the reverse, that mankind before conversion remain under his power and dominion. On this subject Mr. S. says, "when Christ had finished the work of redemption, he ascended up on high, and led captivity captive. Eph. iv. 8.

‡ The Hebrew word is Kapar, which has been already explained.

Pſalm lxviii. 18. They who were in captivity to the devil, are now captivated by Jeſus, by his love, and led captive to glory"—This is a nice ſpeculation indeed! Jeſus Chriſt has finiſhed the work of redemption, and led ſinners captive to glory, and yet they, poor ſouls are under the power of the devil. Redemption is complete, the ranſom is conſummated, and ſtill the objects of it are left to pine in bondage to the god of this world!—The Saviour redeems and triumphs, but not a ſingle ſoul mounts upward in his train! This is giving him a mock triumph truly!—Where did the author learn that "leading captivity captive," means captivating ſinners by love? If that be true, it will happen that Jeſus has not yet aſcended up on high, and never will, until all the ranſomed of the Lord arrive at Mount Sion. The paſſages he refers to, (Eph. iv. 8. Pſ. lxviii. 18.) give a very different repreſentation of Meſſiah's aſcenſion and triumph. Having ſpoiled principalities and powers, and dragging them captive in his train, the exulting Conqueror aroſe into the higheſt heavens, and received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious. What theſe gifts are, the ſcriptures every where aſſure us; repentance and the remiſſion of ſins with every ſpiritual bleſſing. Compare Eph. iv. 8—14. with Acts v. 31. 2 Tim. ii. 25. Our redemption from ſin and ſatan is the effect of Chriſt's death and aſcenſion into glory, and is a redemption by power, not by purchaſe. "Who was delivered for our offences, and was raiſed again for our juſtification—Who is he that condemneth? it is Chriſt that died, yea, rather that is riſen again, who is ever at the right hand of God, who alſo maketh interceſſion for us."* The redemption by blood was complete, final, and eternal, when Jeſus ſuffered, the juſt for the unjuſt, and aſcended to his glory. On the croſs, he ſaid, "it is finiſhed;" and the apoſtle informs us "that he having purged our ſins, ſat down

* Rom. iv. 25.—viii. 34.

on the right hand of the Majesty on high." And again, "By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained *eternal redemption* for us."* From this it is plain, there was accomplished a complete and eternal redemption, when the Saviour ascended on high. This redemption, was not that redemption from the devil or sin, which is effected by the power of a risen Saviour; but a redemption from the claims of offended justice. The one opened the way for the other; and they are in their nature, very distinguishable, though as closely connected as cause and effect.

But why does Mr. S. call it redemption at all, when all that the Saviour has done (and he will do more, than he did upon earth) may prove utterly unavailing and ineffective, unless sinners put forth the wonder-working power which they possess in faith and repentance? He says much about Christ's finishing redemption, and paying the full price to the devil; and lo, after all, men are the slaves of sin and satan, till they exert their own strength; or to use the idiom of a kindred philosophy, till they *energize*, and then their emancipation takes place—God pardons them on the account of their penitence; justifies them because they are actually righteous, and takes them to glory, because they have done well. Where is the redemption, when there is no release till it is self-procured? Where is the grace in justifying one who is already just? Or where is the mercy in saving a sinner, when he claims heaven on the right of absolute merit or personal holiness? There is then no grace, no mercy, no redemption through Jesus—His blood never reconciled God, or procured forgiveness—No intercession of his, prevails for sinners in the court of heaven—No power of his awakens, converts, or sanctifies them—And the price which he paid to the devil, was, it seems a *quid recusabile*—

---

*Heb. i. 3.—ix. 12.

ſomething that [illegible] be re[illegible] as fact proves, that he do[illegible] not giv[illegible] the cap[illegible] payment. How then do they obt[illegible] redemp[illegible]n? [illegible]ey burſt the chain of bo[illegible]dage, and [illegible] They *energize* and their fetters [illegible]op off. Here [illegible] redemption at the expence of the Saviour's blood, power and interceſſion!— [illegible] doctrine deſerves commiſeration, rather than a ſerious anſwer. Mr. Stone goes on to obſerve, that "he redeems us from the curſe of the law." "Chriſt has redeemed us from the curſe of the law, being made a curſe for us; for it is written, curſed is every one that hangeth on a tree. Gal. iii. 13. (See anſwer to obj. 9, p. 23.) Here for once the author was likely to have come into contact with truth, but the angel frighted him, and off he flies into one of the wildeſt ſallies men ever made. In page 35, he tells us what the curſe was, from which Jeſus redeemed ſinners. "He [the apoſtle] has ſufficiently explained his meaning in the paſſage which is objected, [that is Gal iii. 13.] by quoting theſe words from the writings of Moſes, "For it is written, curſed is every one that hangeth upon a tree." For the confirmation of truth, and to ſeal this teſtimony, Jeſus ſubmitted to be hanged upon a tree, or crucified, as though he were a real malefactor" By the curſe of the law then, the apoſtle meant *crucifixion*, and he had *fully explained* his meaning by quoting Moſes, who makes the curſe to be hanging on a tree or *crucifixion*. But Jeſus Chriſt came to redeem us from the curſe of the law, which is fully explained to be crucifixion; therefore he came to redeem ſinners from BEING CRUCIFIED—Mankind will ſurely be very grateful for this immenſe redemption; that is ſuch of them as *do not happen to die* upon CROSSES. The author alſo defines the curſe to be "miſery ariſing out of ſin;" but the apoſtle had fully explained his meaning of the curſe, by calling it *crucifixion;* and the preacher ſhould have ſtuck to his text, without attempting to contradict Paul. It is hardly *decent* to ſet Paul at commenting, and after hearing a full explanation of the ſubject from him, to turn about and give it a *new gloss.*

But admit the curſe to mean miſery ariſing out of ſin; and part of that miſery at leaſt is pain, ſorrow and death. Has Jeſus redeemed us from theſe? No; for all men ſuffer them, and of courſe there is no more redemption in this inſtance, than in the former ones, of being redeemed from ſin and the devil. "By faith in the teſtimony, the ſinner is redeemed from the curſe of the law, or from the miſery ariſing out of ſin." Ah! here again is that wonder-working faith, which according to the doctrine we hear, does more for the ſinner than ever Jeſus did—But does faith actually free the ſinner from the miſery ariſing out of ſin? Not ſo; for the ſubjects of it ſtill feel pain and die. So that on the author's own principles there is no redemption, or at beſt but a partial, defective one.

Mr. S. ſays, none but the wicked ever thought that Jeſus Chriſt was curſed by the law or God, and thinks the Apoſtle's meaning quite clear, from the quotation made from Moſes. If the reader will turn to Deut. xxi. 23, he will ſee a direct refutation of what the author advances: "for he that is hanged upon a tree, is accurſed of God."

It is a horrible thing with the author to ſuppoſe that God ſhould curſe any one. It is folly however, to talk of a curſe on any other principle; as there is no real curſe but God's. Who can curſe if he does not permit? Let Balaam anſwer, "How ſhall I curſe whom God hath not curſed?"* One of the titles of Chriſt as God-man in the Hebrew Scriptures, is Allue, which ſignifies one that is *accurſed*, or ſubject to a curſe. This title is given to him as God and Redeemer, in Deut. xxxii. 15. Job xix. 25—27. and it appears from this very circumſtance, that he was viewed and worſhipped by the ancient believers, under the idea of

---

* Numb. xxiii. 8.

his be[illegible] implied, a curſe for the
[illegible] hath redeemed us
[illegible] made a *curſe* for us:
[illegible]ry one that hangeth
upon a tree." In this ſa[illegible] he is ſaid to be made
ſin for us, and to have ta[illegible] the world with ſin.
"For he hath made him to [illegible] for us, who knew no
ſin. So Chriſt was once offered to bear the ſins of
many; and, unto them that look for him, ſhall he ap-
pear the ſecond time *without ſin*, unto ſalvation."†
He will appear the ſecond time without *ſin*—that is,
without being offered to bear ſins as at his firſt coming,
without making his ſoul an offering for ſinners---with-
out being made any more a curſe or ſin-offering. Theſe
plain texts which could not be warped about to mean
crucifixion, or any thing elſe rather than the curſe of
God, Mr. S. choſe to keep out of view. As to 1. Cor.
xii. 3. "No man ſpeaking by the ſpirit of God, call-
eth Jeſus accurſed," it has no reference to the preſent
ſubject, and only means that no one, be he Jew or Gen-
tile, who thinks or ſpeaks under the light or influence of
the ſpirit of God, can reject our Divine Lord and Sa-
viour, and talk of him as tho' he were an impoſtor a-
bandoned of God; or can deſignedly detract in any
reſpect from his glory; it being inconſiſtent with the
deſign of the Holy Ghoſt to iuſuſe any ſuch blaſphe-
mous ſentiments.

Mr. Stone alſo obſerves upon this ſubject; "We
have already ſeen that the law is love---What curſe
can then be in love? Not any." (p. 35.) His idea of
the law is analagous to his notion of God's having no
wrath againſt ſin, and both are equally falſe. The Pſal-
miſt ſays, "from his right hand went the fiery law;"
and the Apoſtle calls the law the "miniſtration of

---

* See Parkhurſt on the word. † 2Cor. v. 21. Heb. ix. 28.

death," and that which "worketh wrath."* To see that both God and the law curse the sinner, let the reader open his Bible, and read the following passages: Prov. iii. 33. Mal. ii. 2---4. 6. Gen. xii. 3. Jud. v. 23. Numb. xxii. 6. Jer. xlviii. 10. Mat. xxv. 41. Gal. iii. 10. Deut. xxix. 20, 21---When he has read all these, let him take his station near Mount Ebal, and hear the many curses which the law utters against the transgressor. (See Deut. 27 and 28 chapters.) This done, let him ask himself whether the *daring writer* of these Letters does not directly give the lie to the lively oracles of God?

"God did not redeem us from himself." p. 24. To this I subscribe cordially. God does not redeem us from *himself*, but only from that operation of his power and anger, called in Scripture *judgment*, or his *strange work* † To release the transgressor from the punishment due to his crimes, which none but God can do, is not redeeming from himself, but to himself. Should the chief Magistrate of Kentucky be induced, from certain considerations, in consequence of the mediation of certain worthy citizens, to suspend the operation of law upon a prisoner in the penitentiary, and release him from confinement; would any person in that case be weak enough to say, the Governor had redeemed him from himself, when it is plain the prisoner had been redeemed to the executive, to society, and even to law.

"Some affirm, that Christ redeemed us from the hands of justice. This is the same as to be redeemed out of the hands of a just God." (ibid.)

---

* Psalm lxviii. 17. 2. Cor. iii. 7. Rom. iv. 15.

† Rom. ii. 5. Isai. xxviii. 21.

If any are unguarded enough to utter themſelves in a ſtyle ſo impious, they deſerve ſomething more than contempt. Chriſt did not redeem ſinners from juſtice itſelf, but from a certain effect of juſtice, which is the puniſhment of ſin. They are redeemed *from* juſtice, as it inflicts vengeance; but *to* juſtice, as it "kiſſes peace." Through the propitiation of Jeſus, the juſtice or righteouſneſs of God, is illuſtriouſly diſplayed. He now appears as juſt in pardoniug ſin, as he would have been in puniſhing the ſinner, had no propitiation been made.‡ So that while we are ſaved from a juſt God that puniſhes ſinners, we are ſaved to a juſt God, who forgives inequity, and *juſtifies the ungodly;* and while we are ſaved from a certain operation or effect of juſtice, the puniſhment of ſin, we are ſaved to juſtice in its moſt glorious exerciſe, the pardon of ſin throurh the blood of Jeſus.

"It may now be aſked, if Chriſt, or God in Chriſt, redeems from the devil and ſin, and if he gave his blood as the ranſom or price, who got the price?"

After thus formally propoſing the queſtion, Mr. S. ſeems to falter a little, in anſwering it directly, and attempts to make the Apoſtle anſwer it in Heb. ii. 14. though the Apoſtle's words give no ſuch idea as he ſuggeſts.

Having thus fortified himſelf by a miſapplied quotation, he ventures to add, "Here we ſee the devil had the power of death, and got the PRICE, which was the DEATH OF CHRIST." (p. 14.) Oh! Mr. S. eat theſe dreadful words!--Dreadful words to drop from the pen of a man, who appears before the world in the venerable character of an Apoſtle of truth!---Yes, recall them, and pray God to forgive you for writing them.

---

‡ Rom. iii. 25, 26.

What! was the blood, the "precious blood" of Chriſt given to a foul abominable fiend? Was God ſo deeply indebted to the Prince of hell, that the richeſt blood in the univerſe muſt flow out in payment? Was the Supreme Being ſo weak, ſo devoid of reſource, ſo thwarted and baffled in his meaſures, as to be obliged to compound with a poor, damned rebel, who is *reſerved in chains of darkneſs to the judgment of the great day*, and pay him ſuch a price for the ranſom of ſinners? Was the Almighty Father ſo mercileſs, ſo loſt to tenderneſs, as to deliver up his own, *his only Son*, to glut the malice of a blood-thirſty demon? Was the innocent Lamb of God made a victim, and immolated upon the altar of hell, to appeaſe the wrath of the devil? O ſacred God! how low is thy power reduced, how is thy character ſtigmatized, how is thy glory tarniſhed by ſuch a doctrine! What a *libel* on TRUTH and the CROSS! Its worſt enemies could wiſh no more to render it contemptible. No feature of infamy could be impoſed upon chriſtianity that would make it more diſguſting, more ſhocking, more repulſive, than the hideous one we now contemplate.

Nor is this all, if we admit the odious idea of Chriſt's blood being given to the devil, it follows inevitably that the patriarchal and Moſaic inſtitutions which ſhadowed out the ſacrifice of Jeſus, were poſitive eſtabliſhments for ſacrificing to devils. If God offered up his ſon's blood as an oblation to ſatan, it cannot be doubted that the pre-figuring blood of animals ſlain in ſacrifice, muſt have been devoted in the ſame way. Thus all the victims which bled or ſmoked upon the ancient altars, were ſo many ſacrifices to devils. Nor are thoſe idolaters to be blamed, who, impelled by a barbarous ſuperſtition, have offered up their children to Moloch, Thor, or Woden, as the practice of ſacrificing human victims has received the ſanction of divine example. This finiſhes the *climax of degradation*. The law and the teſtimony want nothing more to hold them up to univerſal contempt and deteſtation.

Let not the world, however, think Mr. S. an original in this idea—Mr. Morgan had publiſhed it before him to expoſe chriſtianity. "If the deliverance of mankind from the power and dominion of ſatan, had been by a proper purchaſe or price of redemption paid for them, it ſeems moſt reaſonable, that the price of redemption ſhould be paid to the conqueror, who had them in poſſeſſion, whoſe priſoners they were, and who thereupon pleaded a right in them by conqueſt, i. e. the DEVIL."*

To obviate the force of the many texts, which ſay, that Chriſt died for us, and ſhew that they do not mean his dying *in the room*, or *in the ſtead of* ſinners, Mr. S. appeals again to the original, and gives his reader a labored criticiſm on the word uper, *for*. Without detaining the plain reader with a formal refutation of what the author advances, I will call his attention to a paſſage where *for* muſt mean *in the room of*, and nothing elſe; becauſe there is a poſitive inſtance given of one perſon's dying in the room of another, to ſave his life. "For ſcarcely for uper] a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for [uper] a good man ſome would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet ſinners, Chriſt died for [uper] us." Rom. v. 7, 8. With theſe plain texts before us, we may defy Mr. S. nay, an hoſt of critics, and calmly acquieſce in the doctrine of *ſubſtitution*.

As to what Mr. Stone obſerves, page 31, that the ancient believers had no reſpect to the blood of Chriſt, in offering their ſacrifices, I think but little neceſſary in reply—What has been already laid before the reader, ſufficiently refutes not only that idea, but all that he has advanced relative to ſacrifices under the law, being deſigned to awaken penitence in the minds of the

* Moral Philoſ. v. 156.

persons who made them. I will only add a few passages from scripture to shew that his notion is wholly unfounded. Job, who, as we have already seen, worshipped the Redeemer as one that would be made a curse for sinners; says, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth," &c. Job. xix, 25, 26, 27. Compare chap. xxxiii. 23, 24. Christ informs us, that Abraham, whose faith is contrasted with that of the blinded Jews, whom he then addressed, rejoiced to see his day. "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad." John viii. 56. And the apostle declares that Moses observed the passover in faith of Christ. "Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt." Through faith he kept the passover, and the sprinkling of blood, lest he that destroyed the first born should touch them. Heb. xi. 26---28. See also verse 19. 1 Cor. x. 1—4. And how is it that we are exhorted to imitate the ancient saints in faith and patience, if they knew nothing of a Saviour? "That ye be not slothful, but followers of them, who through faith and patience inherit the promises." Heb. vi. 12. Mr. Stone grants that "that there is now no other name under heaven by which we can be saved, but the name of Jesus;" but if we are to follow the ancient saints, who knew nothing of Christ or his gospel, [illegible] same faith (as we are admonished by the scriptures) then we at any rate *must be damned*, whatever has become of them.

Mr. Stone thinks that Isaiah liii. 6, 7, 11, 12, is explained by Matt. viii. 16, 17, where Christ is said "to take our infirmities, and bear our sicknesses." To bear sickness he contends was to heal it, and to bear sin is to heal it, or bear it away. From what he says, one would be led to imagine he meant to keep up the analogy between healing diseases, and healing or bearing away sins; and that as a divine power was necessary in the cure of diseases, so it must be in the cure of sins: but no

dropped, and the reaſoner gets his concluſion on a new principle, i. e. the mind acts faith in Chriſt, and is delivered from ſin. If the caſes are really analogous, let the analogy be preſerved; let as much be inferred in one caſe as in the other; and as omnipotent power was requiſite for caſting out devils, and curing ſickneſs, let it be argued that it is equally ſo, for bearing away ſin, and healing the ſinner. Then the argument will be fair and impreſſive, and the doctrine much better than what the author generally gives. If the analogy be not preciſe and definite, if it cannot be preſerved, as it appears from the cloſe of the argument, then it was unfair to introduce it at all. But indeed it is unneceſſary to take any pains in expoſing the reaſoning, as it clearly refutes itſelf.

It was in conſequence of the imputation of guilt, and upon the principle of expiation, that Chriſt felt pain and ſorrow in his own perſon, or relieved thoſe who were poſſeſſed with devils, or affected with various diſeaſes of body and mind. Such interference of mediatory power ſubſerved the purpoſes of his kingdom of grace. We know that every evil muſt have been inflicted on account of ſin, as God never inflicts [illegible] without cauſe. From this view we may account [illegible] application of that paſſage of Iſaiah liii. iv. to the Saviour by the evangeliſt Matthew: "Himſelf took our infirmities, and bare our ſickneſſes." If there had been no imputation of guilt, Jeſus could never have according to juſtice, felt pain, or ſympathiſed with the wretched in their ſufferings; and if there had been no ſuch thing as the expiation of ſin, there never could have happened any deliverance from the puniſhment due to ſin, or any relief from pain.

But leſt this ſenſe of *bearing ſin* might not apply, other views are given of the ſubject. It may mean bearing one another's burdens or infirmities, as Ezekial bore in viſion the iniquities of Iſrael; or it may

children of Iſrael, when he went into [illegible]:
or it may mean the burden or [illegible]
may mean any thing with this [illegible]
ſuffering for ſinners on the [illegible]
guilt. And I would [illegible]
innocent being can ſuffer [illegible]
than that of a transf[illegible] effect
think that ſuch a vi[illegible] *bearing*
pounds that variety of [illegible] by which
viour's paſſion is pointed [illegible] the prophet?
it ſaid of any man or prophet, that *it pleaſed the Lord to bruiſe him, and put him to grief*—that *his ſoul was made an offering for ſin*—and that *he poured out his ſoul unto death*? Or where is it ſaid of any man or apoſtle, as it is in the New Teſtament, that *he appeared to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf*—that he was offered to bear the ſins of many—that after he had offered one ſacrifice for ſins, he ſat down forever on the right hand of God—that his blood cleanſeth from all ſin, and purges the conſcience from dead works—or that his blood waſhes, juſtifies, ſanctifies, and redeems ſinners to God? No ſir, all your rhetoric paſſes for nothing, and can be conſidered only as a decent ſlide-off from the real point in debate. To determine the meaning of *bearing ſin*, it may be proper to obſerve that the Hebrew word, uſed by Iſaiah, (liii. 4, 12.) to deſcribe Meſſiah's bearing iniquity, is often made uſe of to expreſs a tranſlation of guilt from one perſon to another, ſo as that the laſt became obnoxious to the puniſhment due to ſin in the firſt. Thus it is employed to expreſs a tranſlation of the peoples' guilt to the Levitical prieſts and ſacrifices, which were types of Chriſt's prieſthood, and ſacrifice through which ſin was pardoned, and puniſhment averted. The learned Parkhurſt renders the word thus; "To bear ſin as an offender, to be reckoned as a ſinner, and puniſhed accordingly:" and he goes on to obſerve that in Lev. v. 1, 17—xxiv. 15. it ſignifies to bear ſin in a vicarious manner, or in the room of the ſinner; as Aaron typically bore the ſins of the people: and as

Christ really bore them.* Compare Exod. xxviii. 38. [illegible] these verses in Isaiah liii. No idea [illegible] to Mr. [illegible] the imputation or transferring of guilt from [illegible] person to another, and [illegible] abounds with it. The whole ri- [illegible] a first principle, and [illegible] well as typical christianity is founded [illegible] was more familiar to the minds of [illegible] when inspiration was given—When Jacob [illegible] the plan which his mother proposed, [illegible] on me be the curse, my son, only obey my [illegible] Judah proposed to assume the guilt of Benjamin, and endure the penalty of his crime. Abigail, when mediating between Nabal and David, with a view to avert the indignation of the prince from her husband, takes the crime upon herself, and even calls it her own trespass. "Upon me, my lord, upon me let this iniquity be—I pray thee, forgive the trespass of thine hand-maid."‖ The woman of Tekoah, uses the same language of imputation to David. "My Lord, O King, the iniquity be on me, and on my father's house: and the King and his throne be guiltless."** And when Pilate said "I am innocent of the blood of this just person; the Jews replied, his blood be upon us, and upon our children." These instances shew that the idea of imputation was not strange or uncommon in those times; and that bearing sin, and enduring the punishment, were precisely the same. I shall dismiss the question by a few quotations, which establish very expressly our opinion of what is meant by bearing sin. The holy garment shall be upon Aaron and his sons, when they come near

---

* See Parkhurst upon the word; Pool's Synopsis on Isaiah liii. Lev. i. 4. and xvi. 21—28. and Edwards' Miscel. Observ. p. 358, 359.

† Gen. xxvii. 12, 13. ‡ Gen. xliv. 33. ‖ 1 Sam. xxv. 34, 28. ** 2 Sam. xiv. 9.

unto the altar to minister in the holy place, that they *bear not iniquity and die.* They shall therefore keep mine ordinance, lest they *bear sin for it, and die thereof* if they profane it. Neither must the children of Israel henceforth come nigh the tabernacle of the congregation, lest *they bear sin and die.**

Mr. S. will not allow that the cup [illegible] drank, mentioned Matt. xxvi. 39. John xviii. 11. could mean the wrath of God, because he said to his disciples, "Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with." Matt. xx. 22, 23.

That exact conformity between the sufferings of Jesus and these disciples was not intended, appears from fact; because neither of them died upon a cross. The author, should also have remarked, the difference of expression in these passages—"The cup which my Father gave me, shall I not drink it—Ye shall drink indeed of my cup." Jesus drunk the whole cup, they only drink *of it*, or partake of it partially—A full draught and a sip are certainly very distinguishable things. I would observe further, that if the wrath of God [illegible] no part of that cup which Jesus drunk, we will be wholly at a loss to account for the events of his passion. Why that agony and depression, that anguish and sweat of blood which marked his retreat in the garden? Why that cry of desertion upon the cross? "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me," if he endured no wrath for sinners? Or why those darkened heavens and convulsions of nature, if no indignation of God lighted up the sufferer? When all nature wore the aspect of vengeance, did the God of nature smile? Jesus has described it himself in one word; "If these

---

* Exod. xxviii. 43. Lev. xxii. 9. Numb. xviii. 22. see also Lev. vii. 18. where the same thing is expressed, and also the obnoxious doctrine of imputation.

things be done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry." If innocence thus suffer, where guilt is only [illegible] how intolerable will be the doom of iniquity? If [illegible] wrath, no preternatural suffering be supposed in [illegible] death of Jesus, it is less dignified, and happy than th[illegible] of a thousand martyrs who have suffered in hi[illegible] Their faces shone with joy while they trod [illegible] but we see the Son of God sorrowful, [illegible] ans and uttering cries in death. Why [illegible] like Stephen in the moment of [illegible] he endured the pains of crucifixion, and the d[illegible] only?* Was he more feeble [illegible] martyr? Or why was [illegible] of the Fa[illegible] When we consider [illegible] making w[illegible] and pouring out the [illegible] for sinners, our admiration of [illegible] magnanimity is lost in as[illegible] Mr. Stone's plan, he has acted [illegible] others who have drunk the [illegible] Mr. S. degrades the death of Je[illegible] low the level of martyrdom, even an [illegible] life and death of Socrates [illegible] and death of Jesus are [illegible] of a God."

"[illegible] rong. Wit[illegible] envy, the cold for[illegible]

---

* Mr. S. accounts for the sorrows of Jesus, by saying, "the dogs of hell were let loose against him." This expression is as low as it is shocking. It does really seem as if he meant to ridicule the death of Christ, by unkennelling hell to worry and torment him. We believe indeed that Jesus was tempted in that hour of darkness, but we believe too that he repelled the assaults of satan, as he had done before in the wilderness. "The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me." John xiv. 30.

† J. J. Rousseau---Letter to the Archbishop of Paris.

mality and deadneſs, which exiſt to the diſgrace of the chriſtian name." (P. 36.)

Yes we will witneſs with pain, Mr. Stone, that you and your aſſociates in revolt, have done all that you could do, to increaſe parties and excite the evils of diviſion. The work is all your own. You have the honor of it! if it is one, of reiterating the old affair of ſchiſm, and of introducing a moſt afflicting ſcene of diſcord, bitterneſs and envy. How many congregations, who were united in the ſweeteſt bonds of Chriſtian fellowſhip, have had their peace violated, their harmony interrupted, their fervor chilled, and the many evils of religious faction excited amongſt them? How many families, once peaceful andhappy in their profeſſion of religion, have been ſet at variance, and have had the ſoft cords of chriſtian intercourſe broken off, perhaps for ever? Loſt to every ſentiment of tenderneſs and charity, you have aimed at unhinging the mind, and diſſolving the bands of ſociety; and have appeared more ſolicitous to diſſeminate your doctrines, than to preach the goſpel; to bring over to your opinions, thoſe whom you confeſſed to be chriſtians, than to convert ſinners. Your zeal has expended itſelf, not in making men chriſtians, but in giving their opinions a certain ſhape and figure. Not contented with attempting the ruin of the church from which you had revolted, you carry on hoſtilities every where, and aim at the overthrow of order and peace in every other ſociety of chriſtians—Nay you have ſubſerved the cauſe of infidelity, not only by *preaching its doctrines*, but by doing what *it* could never have done, you have divided and diſtracted the churches. If theſe things merit the laurel! with it your head ſhall be eternally green.

The moſt extraordinary thing in this publication occurs in the concluſion: "The woman travailing to bring forth the man-child *truth*."

Truth then is not the offspring of heaven, but of

the woman—The fair ſtranger has never yet viſited our forlorn earth ; but now he comes, and the nations will exult at his approach! The woman is now in the ſtate of parturition, and ſoon we may hail the wondrous boy.

From this it would ſeem that he has not yet appeared, and if ſo, Mr. S's book cannot be what it profeſſes, an anſwer to the queſtion, " What is Truth!" But it is not meant ſo---the idea is advancing, and even now is partially diſcloſed to obſervation. And what may be ſeen? *The Apology of the Springfield Presbytery, Their Last Will and Testament, and Two Letters, entitled Atonement.* What the man-child's features, ſtrength, and proportions will be, we may venture to prognoſticate without danger of miſtake, for a Hercules, may always be known by his foot. Monſtrum horrendum in forme ingenes cui lumen ademptum.

" O monſter, horrid to the ſight,
" Hideous, deformed and void of light."

WATTS.

What ſtrange contradiction is here! All along we have heard much about the plainneſs of truth, the ſimplicity of the goſpel, and the eaſe of underſtanding and believing it ; and now behold the church muſt travail, ſtrong throes muſt ſeize her, ere the world can be bleſt with the viſion of the man-child truth.

Thus I have given as conciſe a reply as I well could, to that extraordinary publication, entitled " Atonement," which conceals under that ſpecious name a total renunciation of the doctrine, as taught in the ſcriptures. What Arians, Photinians, Socinians, and Deiſts have done in every age to deſtroy this grand diſtinguiſhing doctrine of our holy faith, has been attempted in the book before me, and that too, under a maſked veneration for the blood of the croſs. Ah! my dear ſir, what have you done? You have meditated the ruin of

our only prop for eternity, our deareſt pledge of peace with God, the ſacrifice of Jeſus. You have attempted wreſting from us, the ſheet-anchor of our hope, and would leave us at the mercy of the winds and the waves. Oh "Beware with what intent you touch that holy thing," the blood of the covenant. Even to eſteem it lightly is damning. Beware leſt you tread under foot the Son of God, and deny the Lord that bought you. *I conjure you in the words of* Tertullian to Marcion, who like yourſelf aſſailed the doctrine of the croſs: "Spare the only hope of the whole world, O thou, who deſtroyeſt the moſt neceſſary glory of our faith."—Shall I offend by this plainneſs? I mean it not. It is not your reproach, but your converſion at which I aim; even now I would preſs you to a heart that bleeds for you; and were it poſſible, would blot out forever with my tears the ſhame, of your apoſtacy; but I will be ſilent and let Heaven and Earth ſpeak.

To you, the church, proſtrate in duſt, bathed in tears, and bleeding with many a wound, lifts up the warning voice, "Kiſs the Son, leſt he be angry, and you periſh from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little." To you, ten thouſand martyrs cry from croſſes, racks, ſtakes, and ſcaffolds, and ſay, "will you fruſtrate our teſtimony of blood." To you, Calvary, ſtained with ſacred blood, watered with tears, and echoing back the groans of the dying Jeſus, calls in a voice of tenderneſs, "rob not the holy croſs of its glory." All nature trembling, convulſed and lowering with vengeance, murmurs in the language of terror, "Do not crucify the Son of God afreſh, nor put him to open ſhame." A venerable groupe in glory, the patriarchs, the prophets, and the ſaints of ancient days, look down and ſay, "receive the teſtimony we bore." The apoſtles, bending from their thrones, point indignant to the croſs, and aſk, "Will you deny the Lord that bought you?" A vaſt multitude which no man can number, ſtretching along the heavenly hills, clothed in white, and bearing in their hands the palm of victory, reproach you as they

ſing "unto him that loved us, and waſhed us in his own blood." An innumerable company of angels reprove you, as they point and ſay, "Theſe are they which came out of great tribulation, and have waſhed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." But lo! above this cloud of witneſſes, riſes one moſt glorious, ſhining as the ſun in his ſtrength; his hairs white like ſnow and as wool, his eyes as a flame of fire, his feet as fine braſs burning in a furnace, and out of his mouth goes a two-edged ſword! Hark! a voice as the ſound of many waters warns you in the road of oppoſition, "Why perſecuteſt thou me, I am the firſt and the laſt; remember therefore, from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do thy firſt works---repent, or elſe I will come quickly and fight againſt you with the ſword of my mouth." Further I cannot go, feeling as I do---Ah, my apoſtate brother, ſtill dear to a heart that bleeds for you, hear his awful voice; fall at his feet, and implore forgiveneſs through his much injured blood. "See that ye refuſe not him that ſpeaketh: for if they eſcaped not who refuſed him that ſpake on earth, much more ſhall not we eſcape, if we turn away from him that ſpeaketh from heaven."

I cloſe this teſtimony for truth, with a ſigh for the exiſtence of thoſe hereſies which have occaſioned it; with tears for the melancholy condition of many dear friends who have ſo ſadly fallen by them; and with a warm and affectionate aſpiration to Almighty God for their converſion to the truth.

EVEN SO, COME LORD JESUS, AMEN.

THE END.